THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

TURN where we will, theologically, to-day we are always encountering the name of Rudolf BULTMANN. Years ago he made his name as the most radical critic of the Synoptic tradition since Strauss. More recently, he fluttered the theological dovecotes with his invitation to Christian preachers to demythologize the New Testament. And nowadays we can hardly engage in theological talk for five minutes without somebody invoking the name of the man from Marburg.

But there are other Continental *Neu-testamentlers*—Stauffer and Jeremias, for example—at least as equally deserving of our study. To be sure, neither Stauffer nor Jeremias is as radical as BULTMANN. Neither proposes to dismiss most of the content of the first three Gospels as *Gemeindetheologie* or to purge the New Testament of myth and interpret what remains after the operation in terms of existentialism. But do these proposals really commend themselves to the good judgment of British Biblical scholars?

These reflections are inspired by a reading of the second volume of BULTMANN's *New Testament Theology* [1] which the S.C.M. have now made available for us in an English dress. This volume expounds the theology of St. John at some length, then discusses the 'Development toward the Ancient Church,' treating in turn the rise of Church order, the evolution of doctrine and the problem of Christian living. In an epilogue BULTMANN gives us his view of what a New Testament theology should aim at, and passes in review the attempts made by his German compatriots to write one. Incidentally, much space is accorded to the teaching of the Apostolic Fathers, among whom only Ignatius is awarded honourable mention: the rest represent, for the most part, a sad falling-away from the inspirations of the New Testament.

Let us confine our comment to the Johannine section. BULTMANN begins with what the Americans call 'orientation'; that is, he fixes the historical position of St. John, considering him in relation to the primitive Christian tradition, Paul, and the Gnostic speculations of the time. This seems to us the soundest part of the book, for he insists that, though a great distance separates John from the preaching of Jesus, John nevertheless is familiar with the tradition which is worked into shape in the Synoptic Gospels. (Our readers will remember how powerfully Hoskyns makes the same point.) Next, he asserts (rightly, as we think) that John 'does not presuppose Paul as a link between himself and the earliest Church.' True, Paul and John have certain things in common—for example, they share 'common-Christian terminology'—but specifically Pauline concepts (*dikaiosynē* in a soteriological sense, the 'flesh-spirit' antithesis, etc.) as well as 'the history-of-salvation perspective' do not occur in John; so that we must see him as 'a figure with his own originality' and no mere pupil of Paul's. (So, we may observe, BULTMANN himself is no mere disciple of Karl Barth, but a theologian in his own clear right and with his own *Weltanschauung*.)

But who was John? We do not know, says BULTMANN. What we do know is that his was 'an Oriental Christianity,' that he writes in a Greek which suggests Aramaic sources at his disposal, and that the style of the 'Revelation Discourses' in the Gospel is the style of Semitic speech, though they also exhibit the basic dualism which characterizes Gnostic thinking. In fine, the Fourth Evangelist, who must have written his Gospel before the end of the first century, sprang from a background of 'gnosticising Judaism.'

Then, starting from Jn 3^{16}, BULTMANN proceeds to sketch John's conception of a world desperately needing salvation but unable to save itself. Why cannot it do so? Because it lies in the grip of falsehood and the powers of darkness. The cause of man's sad declension is his 'will to self-security,' to be seen pre-eminently in the Jews' desire to find security in the Law or in the smug doctrine that

[1] *Theology of the New Testament*, Vol. II. (S.C.M.; 25s. net).

they are Abraham's sons. But man's extremity is God's opportunity. To save men, God sends His Son. The coming of the Son is *the* eschatological event—and the judgment of the world. But His coming awakens opposition: men stumble at the fact that Jesus of Nazareth is indeed 'the Word made flesh'; and in their response to the word of Jesus the judgment takes place.

So BULTMANN passes from one Johannine theme to another: the offence of the Incarnation, the unveiling of the Incarnate Glory, the Revelation of the Word until, in the last chapter, he treats of man's response to the Revelation. Here faith is analysed as 'eschatological existence' and further defined as 'not flight from the world nor asceticism but *desecularization* in the sense of a smashing of all human standards and evaluations.' (This may well be true, but we do not think it is a very happy or helpful way of putting it.)

What then is the heart of John's Gospel? It is the revelation of God's truth in the work and words of Jesus which overcomes the hostility of men. Such a theology, says BULTMANN, has no need of sacraments, and there are none in John. When we read this, we rise at once to protest, 'What about this or that passage which refers to Baptism or the Eucharist.' But our protest is vain: 'Each and all of your alleged references to the sacraments,' replies BULTMANN, 'are interpolations and must be removed.'

Here, then, we must join issue with BULTMANN in strong earnest. If a lesser scholar than BULTMANN, finding evidence that contradicts his thesis, gets rid of it in this cavalier way, not once but many times, we are not slow to tell him what we think of his methods. Why should BULTMANN's eminence safeguard him from the same condemnation? For this, let there be no mistake, is one of BULTMANN's favourite devices. Are there references to 'the last day' in the eschatological passages? Then they must be excised, for John's eschatology is wholly realized (p. 39). Does 1 John speak of Jesus' death as an expiation for sin? Then refuse the evidence, for 'the thought of Jesus' death as an atonement for sin has no place in John' (p. 54). Does Jn 3^5 say, 'Unless a man is born of water and the Spirit,' then the two words 'water and' are 'clearly an interpolation made by an ecclesiastical editor' (p. 58). Does 1 John allude to the Parousia of Jesus? Once again, we must attribute it to the same editor (p. 85). BULTMANN, in short, is our twentieth-century Marcion, 'criticising the New Testament with a pen-knife.'

But our animadversions are not yet at an end. When we leave John behind and pass to the writings of the later apostolic men, we find the same arbitrary radicalism showing itself. Without argument we are assured that 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, and Ephesians are 'deutero-Pauline' and can be grouped along with the Apostolic Fathers. It becomes almost amusing to discover that, when BULTMANN studies the theology of these documents in this setting, he finds them full of Pauline motifs. We do not wonder that he does, but our explanation of the reason why is much simpler.

But perhaps the most serious complaint that most of us will have about this book is its treatment of Jesus as the Revealer. We do not quarrel with this characterization of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, though we think it is one-sided. But, having heard that He is the Revealer, we naturally ask, What then does He reveal? To this BULTMANN replies that He reveals *nothing*. We have always supposed that, if the Johannine Christ reveals anything at all, it is the love of the Father. Is not Jesus made to say in the Gospel, 'Love one another as I have loved you,' and does He not clearly base His command on the assertion, 'As the Father has loved me, so have I loved you'? And if this is so, must we not convict BULTMANN of a serious misrepresentation of John's thought at a cardinal point in the theology?

The scholarship in this book is undoubted, even impressive; it contains many acute insights, many subtle analyses; but we do not think it is a good theology of the New Testament.

Dr. A. Victor MURRAY has written a most important book for religious education in *Teaching the Bible, Especially in Secondary Schools*.[1] Much of the book is occupied with the most practical advice with regard to necessary equipment, and actual teaching methods. But there is much of value in it with regard to general principles also.

Dr. MURRAY has wise things to say about *the Educational Case for Scripture. There is the Literary Value of the Bible.* 'There is the plain fact that Christianity has been the most powerful force in moulding Western civilization, and the Scriptures are the documents of Christianity.' And yet the content of the Bible is not the only important thing of the Bible; the *form* of that content is also important. It is often lack of appreciation of the sheer beauty of that form

[1] Cambridge University Press; 18s. net.

which makes people read books about the Bible instead of reading the Bible itself. 'Quiller-Couch gives wise counsel: "Very well, then: my first piece of advice *on reading the Bible* is that you do it."' 'The Bible *well read* is as necessary a part of the learning of Scripture as the studying of contexts and texts. It is the music of the Psalms and not just their unexpected relevance to a later situation that has retained them in the minds of all serious readers of the Bible.'

There is the use of the Bible for *Moral Teaching*. The Bible's approach to moral training is thoroughly healthy and sensible. 'There is a standard —the life and character of Jesus Himself but there are no abstract maxims which have to be "applied." If "forgiveness" is a desirable attitude to have, it is taught not by discussion but by stories such as those of Jeremiah, the Prodigal Son, and Christ on the Cross. That "honesty is the best policy" appears in Elisha's treatment of Gehazi. It would, however, be quite a mistake to look on them simply as stories illustrating a principle. The stories, so to speak, are the principle. And in all of them regard is had to the persons themselves and to the situation itself, and every situation is dealt with on its merits.' We might put it in another way—the Bible is always aware that every great word must become flesh.

There is the use of the Bible for *Correlation*. It is necessary that the different subjects of the teaching curriculum should have some correlation with each other. Now Scripture has a high degree of correlation. 'It has correlation with history, English, and geography.' The Bible tends to give unity to the isolated items of the school curriculum.

One of the most practically useful sections of this book is the section in which Dr. Murray deals with *Ancient Literary Conventions*. For any Bible reader or Bible teacher to have a thorough grasp of this section would be invaluable. Ancient writers knew nothing of *collation*. When the ancient writers used different accounts of the same events, they made no attempt to collate them. 'They put them all in, leaving their contradictions to be sorted out by the reader.' The simple application of this principle will clear away half the difficulties of the Genesis and Samuel stories.

Ancient writers knew nothing of *copyright*. 'Writings were free for all to use just as they chose, and they could be added to at the end, expanded in the middle with new material, or given prefaces.' The structure of Proverbs, Isaiah or the conclusion of Amos well illustrates this principle.

Ancient writers always preferred *oratio recta* to *oratio obliqua*. They tended always to put what they had to say into direct speech; and when they wished to convey the ideas of some character in their work they did so rather by putting a speech into his mouth than by making a statement of their own. 'The temptation of Jesus in *Matthew* and *Luke* appears in a pictorial and dialogue form instead of as a study of the struggle in His own mind.'

Ancient writers had a different attitude to *causation*. 'Anything which was incapable of a plain straightforward explanation was put down to the direct action of God.' Hence anything which was not immediately explicable became a miracle. All these are simple principles, and yet the statement of them with this cogent lucidity is of great value.

It is of interest to note that one of the greatest advocates of teaching the Bible was none other than Huxley, the great agnostic. In 1870 it was proposed in the London School Board to banish the teaching of the Bible in schools, and it was Huxley who fought for and gained its retention. He spoke of the 'moral grandeur' of the Bible. He spoke of the value of its history. 'It forbids the veriest hind who never left his native village to be ignorant of the existence of other countries and other civilizations, and of a great past stretching back to the furthest limits of the oldest nations in the world.' Then he went on, 'By the study of what other book could children be so much humanized and made to feel that each figure in that vast historical procession fills, like themselves, but a momentary space in the interval between two eternities, and earns the blessings or the curses of all time, according to its effort to do good and hate evil, even as they also are earning their payment for their work?' It is, indeed, significant to find an agnostic pleading the case for the Bible. No teacher of the Bible will fail to find every kind of help in Dr. Murray's book.

Important Hypotheses Reconsidered

IV. The Calendrical Hypothesis of the Origin of Mark

By the Most Reverend Philip Carrington, M.A., Litt.D., Archbishop of Quebec

The calendrical theory of Mark (and Matthew) began as a theory of interpretation. A well-known theory of interpretation associated with the name of Jülicher[1] forbade the scholar to accept the idea of the parables which was presented by Mark out of the words of the Lord. A parable was never mystical or paradoxical or allegorical; it was always a simple comparison illustrating a single point which could easily be grasped.

Mark on the other hand,[2] spoke of a 'mystery' which was only given to some; and of those who stood outside to whom everything came in 'riddles'; and of eyes that looked and looked but could not see. It was argued that Jesus could not have spoken in this way, and would not have used parables to 'hide His meaning,' which it is assumed was always very simple and obvious.

It seemed to me that there was no objection in any case to a critical study of Mark's Gospel from its own point of view in order to discover what part the sayings about spiritual insight and understanding played in the Gospel as a whole and therefore in the tradition which it represented. It was found on investigation that the idea recurred in a series of related contexts; the seed parables in ch. 4, the five thousand in ch. 6, the four thousand in ch. 7, the dialogue at Cæsarea Philippi in ch. 8, and the Transfiguration in ch. 9. The idea of insight and understanding was developed in these contexts, and it was not hard to see that it enfolded the mystery of death and resurrection.

This was not a very astonishing discovery since the growing wheat was a common symbol of death and resurrection in the ancient world. Paul, John, Clement, Justin, and others, interpret the seed parable in this way. There is no reason to assume that they were wrong.

The ideas of seed-time and harvest thus presented themselves, and one remembered that John associated the story of the five thousand with Passover, which coincided with a harvest festival.[3] This suggested the background of the Jewish calendar which is based on the agricultural year. It became apparent that the first ten chapters of Mark might be co-extensive with the calendar year, the five thousand falling on Passover and the four thousand on Pentecost. From that point onward the various points in the Gospel began to fall into their calendrical places with the precision of a jig-saw puzzle.

The parable-teaching, the five thousand, and the Transfiguration were each associated with a retreat into a mountain; and these three mountains divide the first ten chapters of Mark into four approximately equal parts.[4] These four parts correspond to the four seasons of the year, and each begins with a scene of apostolic calling or choosing or authorizing or sending or questioning. Dr. Farrer[5] has pointed out that a new section in Mark always begins in this way.

Each of the four parts begins with a cluster of linked lections which contains apostolic material of this sort with which the teaching on insight and understanding is progressively associated. They form the continuous narrative basis (or framework) of the Gospel. A certain amount of this material is assigned by E. Meyer and W. L. Knox[6] to the hypothetical 'Twelve-Source,' but it actually forms the narrative basis of the Marcan Gospel itself. There is no objective evidence for the existence of a 'Twelve-Source.'[7]

The four parts begin at 1^{1} 3^{7} 6^{7} and 8^{27}; they end at 10^{45}. I was interested to see how closely this division of the material agreed with the division adopted by V. Taylor on quite other grounds in his great commentary[8]: 1^{1} 1^{14} 3^{7} 6^{14} and 8^{27}, ending on 10^{52}. (1^{1-13} is the baptismal prologue preceding the scene of apostolic calling which begins the First Quarter: it is a New Year lection or lections.)

Such is the picture which emerges in the light of the literary analysis. It calls for discussion from the point of view of 'form-criticism.' This school of criticism has produced a prodigious amount of purely hypothetical reconstruction; but it has drawn attention to three important points which

[1] A. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* [1899–1910]. For a recent study on the parables see C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* [1935], and J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* [1954].

[2] Mk 4^{9-13}.

[3] The 'Omer' or Firstfruits; see Lv 23^{9-14} and 1 Co 15^{20}.

[4] See my article 'St. Mark and His Calendar' in *The Church Quarterly Review*, cliv. [April-June, 1953] 211.

[5] Austin Farrer, *A Study in Mark* [1951].

[6] W. L. Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*: Vol. i, *St. Mark* [1953].

[7] The criterion is the use of the word 'Twelve,' which is supposed to distinguish the 'Twelve Source' from a 'Disciples Source' which uses the word 'Disciples.' Knox wisely extends his 'Twelve Source' beyond these limits.

[8] V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* [1952], 107 ff.

were in danger of being forgotten ; one is that the Gospel material was transmitted in the Church by an oral tradition ; the second is that it was formulated in short units, whether narrative or didactic ; and the third is that these units of oral tradition were adapted to the needs of the Church. On the other hand, its conception of an oral tradition is defective, and its picture of the Church and its needs is highly theoretical.

An oral tradition does not mean an unorganized circulation of casual reminiscences from one person to another without any control. An oral tradition means the organized transmission of fixed oral documents from teacher to disciple within a recognized succession. This method of communication was in use in the Rabbinic schools, and the evidence of Mark shows that the disciples of Jesus were organized in a school of this character by their Master. This apostolic school was merged into the Christian Church as the apostolic mission ; mission or sending was its distinctive mark.

Some Protestant scholars of the radical type are of the opinion that the New Testament documents are mistaken on this point, and they have attempted to prove that there was no apostolic mission. Their arguments are reviewed (far too sympathetically) by Dr. Taylor.[1] In any case, we are engaged in analyzing the Marcan Gospel as it stands, and attempting to get some idea of the tradition which it represents, and we do find that it contains as a basic factor the formation of a Rabbinic school of this kind by Jesus, so that this was the view of the origins which was held in the oral tradition out of which Mark wrote his Gospel and in the Church for which he wrote it.

Another question now arises. Was the form and order of Mark's Gospel with its calendar associations drawn by Mark from the oral tradition, or does it represent his editorial work. This is the question asked by Dr. Farrer.[2] Dr. Hooke[3] and Dr. Casey[4] and their criticisms of the calendar theory rather suggest the idea of Mark picking units of Gospel material out of a general pool, and arranging them in accordance with a calendar which was previously a vacant framework ; but we are not committed to such a view. We prefer the view that their oral delivery was already conditioned by the liturgical structure of the Church. The material fits into the calendar pattern so aptly ; and surely, if it was a novel idea, Mark would have drawn attention to it here and there, instead of leaving it to the intelligence of his lector.

[1] *Op. cit.*, 619 ff.

[2] *The Church Quarterly Review*, cliii. [October–December, 1952], 501 ff.

[3] *Jb.*, cliv. [January–March], 44 ff.

[4] ' St. Mark's Gospel ' in *Theology*, lv. [October, 1952], 362 ff.

The oral tradition was an organic factor in the life of the Church, and so was the Hebrew calendar. I have been asked, of course, whether it is possible that the Christian Church could have had a calendar as early as this ; but actually it could not have arranged its business without a calendar, and the Jewish calendar was the one it used. It was a Jewish movement, an extension or offshoot from the Jewish synagogue, and it fell heir to the Jewish liturgical inheritance. Luke and Paul date their movements by Passover, Pentecost, and the Day of Atonement[5] ; and the evangelists mention the days of the Jewish calendar without giving any explanation ; none was necessary.

' Form Criticism ' has done something to explain the existence of the Gospel material in small units, but it does nothing to explain the order in which they were placed when they were written down. According to their reconstructions one would rather expect larger and larger collections of miracles, parables, teachings, and so forth. What one finds is an order which is fundamentally narrative and dramatic. It conforms to history and liturgy. This order may have had its oral origins also.

It is widely believed among scholars that the Passion narrative was designed to be used liturgically at the Passover season. If this possibility is conceded, there is nothing to prevent us from considering the suggestion that the baptism and the five thousand and the Transfiguration had similar associations. We do not have to suppose that Mark had an appropriate lection for every Sunday in the year ; it would be sufficient if he arranged the appropriate Gospel material for the high points in the calendar, and included enough material for the intervening Sundays.[6]

Such is the outline of the theory. We come to the mathematical proof which I would like to see carefully examined and criticised.

The Hebrew liturgical year is a complicated pattern, the outline of which is mathematically determined, though the extent and character of the commemorations is a vast study with many controversial issues. It is possible however to take our analysis of Mark (chs. 1–10) and superimpose it on the sabbaths of the twelve lunar months, and observe the results. If the baptism story is allotted to the first sabbath of the lectionary year, the five thousand and the four thousand do fall quite naturally on Passover and Pentecost respectively, and the rest of the material accordingly. The results are satisfactory.

In order to carry out this test, however, it was necessary to divide the first ten chapters of Mark into their component units as best one could, and

[5] *E.g.*, Ac 20^6, 1 Co 16^8, Ac 27^9.

[6] P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Calendar* [1952], 20.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

so a subjective element entered in ; but actually the Gospels are already divided into chapters in the ancient manuscripts. The oldest manuscript possessing such chapter-divisions is Vaticanus, and these divisions provided an external control. It contains sixty-two chapters, which fit the calendar theory exactly, up to the point of the Transfiguration ; after which point the chapters are lengthened so as to include the thirteenth chapter within the forty-nine or fifty lections which are required for the year. The remainder is allotted to the Passion, which is assigned, of course, to Passover.

The test is a triple one, therefore, our literary analysis of Mark coinciding in a remarkable way with the Jewish calendar, and the chapter-enumeration of Vaticanus coinciding precisely with this double pattern. The appearance in three independent fields of evidence of the same complex pattern can hardly be accidental. We must be looking at a continuous process in which the same pattern is reproduced in three different places ; and, of course, a fourth can be added—the Christian liturgical year. A great deal of corroborative evidence was also brought in, mainly from second-century sources. The investigation thus reached a stage where the theory must be accepted unless some better explanation of the evidence can be found.

I have not seen any attempt to discredit the presentation of the evidence except for some vigorous comments by Dr. Casey.[1] The textual evidence presents a complicated field for research. The systems of chapter-enumeration are obviously related to one another. There is an old Greek system which appears first in Alexandrinus, and there is an old Latin system of which the Vulgate system is a variant ; the system in Vaticanus is unique. The Old Greek system has a shorter arrangement for Mark, with forty-eight or forty-nine lections, thus including the Passion narrative within the calendar year ; on the other hand, they give Matthew sixty-eight or sixty-nine [2] which agree very closely with the arrangement of Mark in Vaticanus, and may preserve an older form of it.

The shorter arrangement of Mark in the Old Greek appears to be ancient, however, since it coincides closely with the chapter-divisions in the *Diatessaron* of Tatian (*c.* A.D. 160).

Dr. Casey points out, however, that the arrangement for Mark in Vaticanus need not be the older of the two, as I had assumed, and he also suggests that the chapter-divisions in the *Diatessaron* are perhaps not original. What we possess is an Arabic translation of a Syriac text, and they may have been added when the translation was made. It is a hard theory to accept, for the Arabian chapter-divider would have made his divisions agree with the Old Greek by sheer chance, and Tatian would have built his *Diatessaron* on the same pattern by sheer chance too ; a double multiple coincidence.

Dr. K. Winter has a word to say on my suggestion that the 68/69 system for Matthew in the Old Greek was based on a hypothetical 68/69 system for Mark which has not survived ; he suggests that the Marcan pattern was based on the Matthaean since he believes that Matthew is the older Gospel. My own work takes for granted the accepted view that Mark was prior to Matthew, but there seems no reason why the theory should not be worked out on the contrary basis by those who prefer it.[3] He also suggests that the hundred and seventy lection system for Matthew in Vaticanus represents an old arrangement for that Gospel based on a three-year cycle of reading, which would follow the oldest lectionary system of the Palestinian synagogues.[4]

Dr. Farrer is unhappy because he does not see how the forty-nine or fifty lections would suffice for the Sundays of the year. The lunar year has three hundred and fifty-four days, so that there is a possible overplus of two Sundays for forty-nine lections and one for fifty, but possibly one or two Sundays might have their special lessons. In any case, these difficulties beset any arrangement for a lunar year,[5] and so does the question of the intercalary month. It has been pointed out to me that Drs. I. and H. Levy, and J. Morgenstern [6] have made interesting researches into an old Canaanite or Galilæan calendar, based on seven ' pentecosts ' of seven weeks each, with festivals at the end of each ' pentecost.' The *Book of Jubilees* has fifty chapters, with a pentecostal lection at approximately every seventh chapter, and this could be read in a calendar year of this kind. I pointed out what seemed to be cases of sets of seven lections in Mark.

I have received much valuable information from Rabbi Abraham J. Brachman of Fort Worth, Texas.[7] To my surprise the calendar theory of

[1] *Theology*, October, 1952.

[2] In the Old Greek enumeration the first lection is not given a number : sixty-nine lections are numbered as 0 to 68.

[3] See B. C. Butler, *The Originality of Matthew* [1951] and P. Parker, *The Gospel before Mark* [1953] for new arguments in favour of this hypothesis.

[4] Dr. Winter's article on the calendrical theory of Mark will appear in a forthcoming number of the Swiss periodical *Judaica*.

[5] See P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Calendar*, 20 f. and 133 ff.

[6] See article by J. Morgenstern on ' The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees ' in *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. V. No. 1 [1955].

[7] See article by Dr. Brachman on ' The Primitive Christian Calendar ' in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, xlv. [January, 1955] 265 f.

Mark fell into line with his researches into the Jewish liturgical year. As I allotted Mark's Gospel units to the successive weeks of the Jewish year (following the enumeration of Vaticanus) I had been disappointed to find that the high point of the Transfiguration fell on what seemed at first to be a vacancy in midsummer. I discovered the midsummer fast of Tammuz and the fast of Ab three weeks later, but I was not surprised when Dr. Farrer found this inadequate. I had no idea then how important they were. I had never heard of the three sabbaths of rebuke and the seven sabbaths of consolation. Rabbi Brachman enlightened me.

Tammuz 17 commemorated the making of the golden calf and the ascent of Moses into the mountain. I could see that there was a correspondence, but I missed the point. Moses offered his life for his people, and Dr. Brachman thinks it is possible that this day originally commemorated his death. The story also occurs in its natural order, as a sabbath lesson, a few weeks earlier, and its '*haftarah*' or prophetic lesson, is the similar story of Elijah in which he too offers his life. In both cases their death is accepted by God; they appoint successors. Jesus, too, offers His life for His people; He goes up into the mountain, and Moses and Elijah appear with Him in glory. There is a high prophetic doctrine here which Jesus had enunciated when He said that the Son of Man must suffer and die and rise again. God's men must give their lives in His service; it must be worked out in their flesh and blood; it is their road to glory.

How old are the Hebrew lectionaries and commemorations? It is a debatable point. It seems clear that Judaism in Palestine used a three-year lectionary, which was not superseded by the one-year lectionary till the end of the second century, though Babylonian Jews had been using a one-year lectionary before that. But the special feasts and fasts formed the nucleus of a partial one-year lectionary from olden times. Among these occasions were the midsummer fasts of Tammuz 17 and Ab 9 or 10, and the feast of Ab 15, which had numerous popular associations. It has been suggested that some passages in the prophets were actually composed for these occasions[1] as were the apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch which passed from the Jewish synagogue into the Christian Church in the apostolic period.

I was obliged to assign the entry of the Lord into Jerusalem to the Feast of Tabernacles, which I was reluctant to do. I did not know that the case for this had already been argued by W. Manson.[2] It needs to be reiterated that there is nothing *in Mark* to connect the entry into Jerusalem and the cleansing of the Temple with the Passover, and no sign at all in Mk 11–12 of 'Holy Week.' It is all undated, and it is not assigned a time-period. There is no evidence either in Mark or in John that Jesus entered the holy city in the week before His passion except for the Last Supper.

Mark 13 is another matter. It seems to have connexions both ways.

The literary analysis of Mark in accordance with its own progressive story of the formation of the apostolic college and their growth in spiritual vision, certainly seems to bring it into line with a stream of religious development in which the same pattern of ideas is continuously repeated, and connexions are established with various related developments in the Jewish and Christian traditions, which were not at that time separated.

The controlling areas in the evidence are the Hebrew liturgical year and the format of the ancient Gospel manuscripts; but the resultant three-dimensional figure has other relations with history. There is the liturgical tradition of Tammuz and Ab in Baruch, Ezra, and the Mishnah; there is the theological handling of the episode of the golden calf in Clement, Barnabas, Justin, and the Midrashim; there is the mass of oral discussion in the 'Rabbinic' school of Papias and the 'Elders,' and the astronomical mysticism of the gnostics; there is the relation of the Passion narrative to the Passover-Pentecost tradition; there are the apocryphal gospels and the *Diatessaron*: there is the Epiphany festival of Basilides; there is the treatment of the Gospels in Irenaeus and others; there is the development of the Christian Year in the second century and later, which involves the calendar of the Montanists, and the calendrical speculations of the 'Alogi', and the scholars quoted by Clement of Alexandria, and Hippolytus of Rome. In proportion to the quantity of the surviving evidence, there is a great deal that is related to calendrical studies.

The New Testament itself has not been fully explored in this connexion. Dr. Manson has investigated the earlier Epistles of St. Paul and the case of the cleansing of the temple. Dr. Farrer has investigated the case of the Revelation. Hebrews, James, and Hermas may conceivably yield some results. The Fourth Gospel has calendrical interests.

Two new books provide learned introductions to the subjects: *Festivals of the Jewish Year* by T. H. Gaster, and *The Evolution of the Christian Year* by A. A. McArthur.

[1] See article by H. St. J. Thackeray on 'Baruch' in *The New Commentary*, ed. by C. Gore.

[2] See his article in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 33, No. 2 [March, 1951]. Also *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. iv. pt. 1 [April, 1953], 77 f.

Jesus and Moses in the New Testament

By the Reverend E. L. Allen, Ph.D., D.D., King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

'I believe with perfect faith that the whole Law, now in our possession, is the same that was given to Moses our teacher, peace be to him. I believe with perfect faith that this Law will not be changed, and that there will never be another Law from the Creator, blessed be His name.'[1] The language is that of Maimonides, but it might well have been that of a first-century rabbi facing the challenge of the Christian 'way.' In the debates of those early days, the contrast of Law and Gospel might also be stated as that of Moses and Christ. 'Thou art his disciple; but we are disciples of Moses,' the Pharisees say to one of the earliest Christian confessors (Jn 9^{28}). The charge brought against Stephen was that of speaking 'blasphemous words against Moses, and against God' (Ac 6^{11}). It was inevitable therefore that Christian thought should find itself called upon to determine the relation between Christ and Moses, and it is not surprising that more than one answer was given to this question. Bultmann is no doubt correct when he denies that the Primitive Church had any interest in Moses as a historical figure with whom Christ might be compared, but he is wrong when he refuses to consider the subject any further.[2]

We may look back upon Moses as the founder of the Jewish religion; in the first century, only a secularized Jew could have thought of him in that way. He was the bearer of the revelation by which Israel lived, and the covenant at Sinai was no mere event in the past, it was an ever-present spiritual reality. Moses accordingly was revered as a *prophet*, the prophet through whom the deliverance of the Exodus had been affected (Hos 12^{13}). He was in a sense the pattern prophet, the first in a succession of prophets (Dt $18^{15.\ 18}$). But he was incomparable, more than a prophet in the sense in which those who followed him were such (Dt 34^{10}). Indeed, he could be spoken of as 'God's chief prophet throughout the earth, the most perfect teacher in the world.'[3] He was also the *servant*. 'Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel' (Mal 4^{4}). Finally, he was the *mediator*. This, as Jeremias points out, was the distinctive feature of the portrait of Moses current in Palestinian Judaism, as opposed to the fantasies of the Dispersion, which tended to make of him a superman.[4] Stephen's speech and the Epistle to the Hebrews show how deeply this conception of Moses as mediator had entered into the thought of the time.

When one considers the extent to which the Exodus provided an imagery for the Christian redemption and the Law served as a foil for the presentation of the gospel, it is clear that the subject I have chosen runs out into what is virtually a New Testament theology. I propose therefore to confine myself to certain passages in which there is an explicit confrontation of Jesus and Moses.

In the earliest speeches of Acts Moses appears as the paradigm certainly for a Prophet-, perhaps also for a Servant-Christology. The Lord is the new Moses, the prophet whose authority Moses attests, and whose word is final, because to reject it is to be cut off from the covenant ($3^{22f.}$). He is also the Servant in the same speech ($3^{13.\ 26}$).[5] The description of Jesus as prophet came naturally to His contemporaries (Mt $21^{11.\ 46}$). But it did not put Him in a class by Himself, since precisely the same judgment was passed on John by the people (Mt 14^{5} 21^{26}). As the new Moses, however, Jesus stood above all other prophets, even as Moses did (Dt 34^{10-12}). For He was not merely one who spoke for God, He was also one who acted for Him, through whom His saving deeds were done.

In Ac 7 the comparison with Moses is more detailed. He is still the supreme prophet (*v.* 37) and now also the mediator (*v.* 38). But it is by what he failed to do rather than by what he did that he is a paradigm for Jesus. The new Moses is like the old inasmuch as He too came to His people with revelation and deliverance, only to be refused by them. This fact of the rejection of Moses may lie behind the strange passage Rev $11^{3ff.}$, and Jeremias even thinks it possible that one of the two sufferers there described was originally the Messiah as the second Moses.[6] At any rate, for the Jewish-Christian circle from which Stephen's speech appears to spring, Christ was acknowledged as the new Moses, like His great predecessor in the deliverance He brought and also in the animosity with which He was received.

[1] *Jewish Prayer Book*, 90.
[2] *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 37.
[3] *The Assumption of Moses*, xi. 16.
[4] *Theologisches Wörterbuch zur N.T.*, iv. 867f.
[5] παῖς not δοῦλος as at Mal 4^{6} (LXX).
[6] *Op. cit.*, 868.

With Paul the theme changes to that of the superiority of Christ to Moses, the latter being considered here as the mediator. Christ is the new Moses in the sense in which He is the new Adam of Ro 5; the relation is one of contrast rather than of fulfilment. The new is opposed to the old as spirit to letter, as life to death, as righteousness to condemnation, as the unveiled face to the veiled, as an abiding glory to a transitory one. To judge from the context, the criticism of Moses is directed against Jewish-Christian missionaries, those who 'corrupt the word of God' (2 Co 2^{17}) or handle it deceitfully (4^{3}). They tend, one must suppose, to assimilate the work of Christ to that of Moses, and this leads Paul to bring out the opposition between them. The interpretation of Ex 34^{33-35} is remarkable. For Paul represents Moses as conscious that his work was only for a time and wanting to conceal the fact from his fellows. How far did he intend to imply this? We cannot say. The argument is parallel to that in Ro 10^{5-10}, where also a Mosaic assertion that the Law is within man's reach is taken in the opposite sense, as proof that it is inaccessible.

The writer to the Hebrews deals explicitly with our theme (3^{1-6}). The passage might easily be taken as a mere digression, but consideration of the context shows that this would be mistaken. The first two chapters have maintained the superiority of Jesus as Son to the angels; it would seem that the author has in mind an angel-Christology he is concerned to refute, returning more than once to the attack. May it not be that he is aware equally of a Christology that comes near to equating Jesus with Moses, though it is of much less influence and therefore does not need the detailed refutation the other received? The Moses-argument, again, introduces with the conditional clause 'if we hold fast our boldness and the glorying of our hope unto the end' a close comparison between Christians, who belong to the 'house' of the Son and the generation of the Exodus, who belonged to the 'house' of Moses. I conclude therefore that the writer has in mind a 'new Moses Christology.' He does not carry his polemic farther, because he is concerned elsewhere to show that Christ is superior to Aaron rather than to his brother.[1]

The writer applies to Moses the title 'servant of the Lord' given him in the Old Testament, though he uses for it the uncommon translation θεράπων (cf. Ex 4^{10}, Nu 12^{7}, Wis 10^{16}). As we have seen, there were Christians who transferred this title to Jesus as the new Moses. The writer seeks, however, to establish a fundamental distinction between them, the status of Jesus being that of Son and not of servant merely. The term servant or attendant, he argues, implies subordination; it denotes some one who is in a subordinate position with a trust committed to him. Jesus, on the other hand, has charge of His Church as a community that is of His own creation and belongs to Him personally. Verse 4 is in the nature of a parenthesis and does not seem to affect the argument, which turns upon the lordship enjoyed by the Son as opposed to the trust discharged by the steward. One thing, it is conceded, Jesus and Moses have in common—their fidelity. But they were faithful at different levels, and so no comparison between them is possible. Christ is the new Moses only in the Pauline sense, as the one who reversed what Moses brought, and that the writer to the Hebrews willingly allows (12^{18-29}).

The Fourth Gospel provides evidence of a Prophet-Christology in some circles at the time of its composition. In view of the Samaritan interpretation of the Dt 18 passage we are not surprised when the Samaritan woman hails Jesus as prophet (4^{19}). But the people to whom she brings news of the Messiah's appearance go on to see in Him much more than a prophet. He is 'the Saviour of the world' (4^{42}). John knows of a similar expectation in Jewish circles (7^{40}), so that it is said of Jesus: 'This is of a truth the prophet that cometh into the world' (6^{14}). Probably, however, the Jewish expectation is of a great prophet as an alternative forerunner of the Messiah. There is some evidence that points towards this and it seems to lie behind the Baptist's disclaimer (1^{21}). The prophet here ranks below the Messiah and Elijah but he belongs in the same eschatological realm. Now, in Jn 9 we have the recognition of Jesus as prophet by the blind man whom He had healed (*v.* 17), and, be it noted, as a prophet who rivals Moses. 'We know that God hath spoken unto Moses: but as for this man, we know not whence he is' (*v.* 29). In the end, however, the man goes on to acknowledge Jesus as Son of God or Son of man, according to the text preferred (*v.* 35). I have argued elsewhere that the central figure in this chapter stands for a Jewish Christian community known to John, for which Jesus is still the prophet and the new Moses, but which he is confident will go on to fuller faith.[2]

In view of the sharp opposition between Christianity and Judaism in the Fourth Gospel, there can be for it no assimilation of Jesus to Moses. He transcends Moses as grace and truth transcend law (1^{17}). Twice something that tradition had ascribed to Moses is taken from him; once it is the manna, which he did *not* give (6^{32}) and once it is circumcision, which comes from the fathers

[1] Perhaps reference should also be made to $11^{23ff.}$, where Moses suffers by a voluntary renunciation on behalf of his people, as Jesus also did (12^{2}).

[2] *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxxiv. 88ff.

(7[22]). Moses is reduced to the rôle of witness and therefore, in the case of those who do not accept the witness, of accuser (5[45-47]).

The evidence is fragmentary and so inconclusive. It seems to me, however, that there is some reason to think that an original attempt to see in Jesus the new Moses, God's supreme Servant and the final and decisive Prophet, led as the result of further reflection to the repudiation of a Servant- and Prophet-Christology in the interests of a Son-Christology. We seem to catch the process at work for a moment in Hebrews, while in John we have reached the stage at which, as far as the main body of Christians is concerned, the Son-Christology has triumphed all along the line. Is there any further evidence in the New Testament of this development? I think there is, in the Transfiguration story. I do not wish for one moment to dispute what others have found in the narrative, whether as an anticipation of the Parousia or otherwise, but only to draw attention to its Christological significance.

The two who appear with Jesus in this are 'Moses my servant' and 'Elijah the prophet' (Mal 4[4f.]). In the first stage of the vision (if we may call it such) Jesus is seen as on the same level with them: Peter proposes to make three tabernacles, one for each. But the vision ends with the declaration that Jesus is more than servant and more than prophet: 'This is my beloved Son: hear ye him' (Mk 9[7]). Is the narrative in its present form a deposit of the Church's faith, reaching out towards a higher affirmation of its Lord? Or does it anticipate within the actual ministry of Jesus, albeit then only for a moment and in symbol, the conclusion at which His followers were subsequently to arrive?

Literature

THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION

A GENERATION ago, if not always to-day, theological students were urged to acquire a Synopsis of the First Three Gospels, by means of which corresponding passages in these Gospels, arranged in parallel columns, could be readily compared for similarities and differences. Professor W. E. Bundy of De Pauw University published in 1932 such a synopsis, and now has followed it up by basing on it a full-scale commentary on the materials of the Synoptic Gospels, dealing with the separate items in the order in which they occur in that synopsis. The title of this very long commentary of five hundred and ninety-eight pages is—*Jesus and the First Three Gospels: An Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition.* In the United States of America it is published by the Harvard University Press and in this country by Geoffrey Cumberledge, and costs 60s. net.

The Foreword warns us of its somewhat restricted aim: 'This study concerns itself exclusively with the literary and historical data of this tradition. The religious value of this tradition, as well as those conventionally associated with it, are left to speak for themselves or to be assumed.' The author makes no attempt to bring out the spiritual or theological implications of the Gospel record (the Beatitudes are passed over in two pages), but in a resolutely detached way he analyses, compares, and criticises the various units of the Synoptic tradition. He himself describes his work as 'a compendium of criticism in the Synoptic field.' Within these rigid self-imposed limits he has produced an exhaustive study of his material, thorough and orderly, and written in a style of most commendable clarity.

Professor Bundy accepts the existence of the document Q (adding indeed, 'Q may have been more of a Gospel than is generally supposed') but without referring to the recent criticisms of this assumption. He is inclined to accept the existence of an 'Ur-Mark,' which all three Evangelists used, rather than the direct dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark. To support this theory he frequently enumerates agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, but without noting the explanations which Streeter offered to account for such agreements. The Proto-Luke theory receives frequent favourable mention, but the author does not commit himself to it.

In the multitudinous footnotes the name of Bultmann recurs incessantly, whereas those of less radical scholars, such as Dodd, Manson and Jeremias, are conspicuous by their almost complete neglect. From this alone the reader may deduce the author's theological alignment. Like Bultmann, he believes that the Gospel tradition contains only the smallest amount of reliable historical material. Its value is that it reflects the faith of the Early Church. The record of God's words to Jesus at the Baptism and the Transfiguration is Mark's dramatization of 'the cardinal Christian conviction that Jesus is the Son of God.' The 'I-am-come' utterances are later Christian creations. The beautifully balanced unit of teaching in Mt 6[1-6. 16-18] is 'so literary as to arouse skepticism as to its ever having been an

oral composition of Jesus at all.' The words of Jesus in Mt 7^{7-8} about asking, seeking, knocking, are described as 'naïve,' 'almost fanatical.' We read: 'It is inconceivable that a man of sane mind and sound heart, such as Jesus certainly was, could ever have regarded himself as the Messiah.' 'It is inconceivable that Jesus ever spoke of himself as the Son of Man.' 'Jesus lived and worked and died as a loyal and devout Jew with no thought of inaugurating a new and different religion.' Not only are the Birth stories dismissed as 'wholly fictitious,' but the Resurrection tradition fares little better: 'Out of the resurrection tradition the historian sifts a single historical fact, not the resurrection of Jesus, but the early Christian belief in his resurrection.'

It is refreshing here and there to find an admission that some word or incident may be regarded as historical, but they are very few. Mk 3^{21} is 'of a nature that excludes the possibility of falsehood, fabrication or invention.' Lk 22^{15-18} gives the 'most authentic account of what Jesus must have done and said and meant at the table on the last night.' So of Mt 10^{5-6}: 'The only possible motive for ascribing it to Jesus must have been the simple fact that it was known to be an utterance of his,' and Mt 10^{28-31} $11^{7-9. 11a. 12-13. 16-19}$, Mk 4^{26-29}, Lk 10^{29-37} are also allowed to be 'authentic.' The test of authenticity is this: 'In all the welter of conception and depiction in the Synoptic tradition the historical traits will be those which are genuinely human, typically Jewish and exclusively religious.' 'Jesus was a Jew and as a Jew must have shared the religious sentiments and feelings of his people.'

There is no wonder that there is little left of the deeds and words ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels, when He who has transformed human life and thought must not be allowed to transcend in any particular either what was normal to Judaism or what is congenial to our human assessment of what is reasonable and practicable. Hardly any real genius could be forced into such a narrow strait-jacket without first being stripped of that which marked him out from his fellows, and we should not expect to be able to reduce to the level of the ordinary One of such stature that men came to honour Him as the Son of God. Had the historical Jesus been merely what Professor Bundy allows Him to have been, could He have stirred that devotion which finally found expression in the faith of the Church?

We do not deny that the circumstances and problems of the Early Church had much to do with the selection of the materials preserved in our Gospels, and that these materials were sometimes modified in the process of communicating them. If we wish to reach the bed-rock of history we must resolutely eliminate all that bears the stamp of Early Church influence. It is, however, not being merely credulous to believe that very many sayings of Jesus, besides Mt 10^{5-6}, were passed on and treasured because of 'the simple fact that they were known to be utterances of Jesus.'

Much as we may dissent from some of Professor Bundy's conclusions, we do, however, welcome his book. It is good for us to have available in English such a book, in which the radical approach is systematically applied to every unit of the Synoptic Tradition. It will compel us to think out again the grounds on which we still believe in the fundamental historical reliability of the main facts and records in that tradition.

C. L. Mitton

JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES' TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE

The first portion of the *New World Translation of the Hebrew Scriptures* was severely reviewed in The Expository Times of November 1953. The second volume of this rendering, containing 1 Samuel to Esther (Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, Brooklyn, New York) has now appeared. The review of the first volume involved the reviewer in a long correspondence with Brooklyn, not very fruitful in its results but warmly friendly in character—despite one acknowledgment of his 'frank but faithless' letter—so that he now feels something of the reluctance with which one criticises friends when he says that the second volume shows the same faults as the first. There is the same wooden literalness and inelegance that marked the earlier volume, giving to the rendering something of the harshness that Aquila's Greek version had. Innumerable examples could be given; a few must suffice. In 1 S 1^{4} we read, 'And there came to be a day when Elkanah proceeded to sacrifice'; in 1^{14}, 'How long will you behave drunk?'; in 10^{9}, 'God began changing the heart of his into another'; in 16^{21}, 'he got to loving him very much'; in 2 S 10^{5}, 'the men had come to feeling very humiliated'; in 18^{13}, 'you yourself would take a position off on the side'; in 1 K 6^{13}, 'I shall indeed tent in the middle of the sons of Israel'; in Ezr 10^{4}, 'the matter devolves upon you'; in 10^{12}, 'Exactly according to your word it devolves upon us to do.' These are not examples of good modern English usage, and it is hard to see what is thought to be the gain of such renderings.

In some cases inelegance is combined with obscurity. Thus it is hard to guess what meaning the ordinary English reader would find in 1 S 19^{5}, 'He proceeded to put his soul in his palm'; or

in 20[19], 'you must come to the place where you hid yourself on the working day'; or in 2 S 1[9], 'Stand, please, over me and definitely put me to death, for the cramp has seized me, because all my soul is yet in me.' Even more obscure is 1 S 23[22], 'Go, please, persevere some more and ascertain and see his place where his foot comes to be—whoever saw him there—for it has been said to me that he himself is surely cunning.'

It is not clear why the lords of the Philistines are regularly referred to as the 'axis lords,' or why Mordecai is called the 'caretaker' of Esther (Est 2[7]), as though she were a bit of real estate. Nor is it clear why the Hebrew לְעוֹלָם is commonly rendered 'to time indefinite' (for example, 1 S 1[22] 13[13] and often), but sometimes by the more familiar 'forever' (for example, 1 S 3[13] 20[23. 42]).

The translators have watched the ancient versions, as well as the Massoretic Hebrew text, and in the footnotes they frequently record the variations found in them. Occasionally they follow the Septuagint, as in 1 S 1[9. 24], but, surprisingly enough, they do not follow it in 1 S 14[41], where it is quite certainly to be preferred to the Hebrew. Here they cheat by rendering 'Do give Thummim,' without telling the reader that this is not what the Massoretic text says, though the reader may feel that this is meaningless without the Septuagint addition, which is printed at the foot, and from which the word 'Thummim' is really taken. The rendering adopted from the Septuagint in 1 S 1[24] has been commonly adopted by editors, though Professor Guillaume has recently pointed out that the Massoretic text, which means 'the boy was a boy,' is an idiom found also in Arabic, meaning 'The boy was a fine child,' so that there is no reason to change it.

In general the translators show that they understand the Hebrew, even though they cannot express its meaning in elegant English, but occasionally their knowledge is defective. In 1 S 1[9] they render 'Then Hannah got up after they had eaten,' but in the footnote volunteer the inaccurate information that the Massoretic text has 'after she had eaten.' In fact, the Hebrew simply says 'after eating' (אַחֲרֵי אָכְלָה), without indicating the subject of the infinitive; 'after she had eaten' would be אַחֲרֵי אָכְלָהּ.

Following modern English usage, the use of the second person singular pronoun is abandoned, but the translators indicate to the reader when the Hebrew has the plural pronoun by printing YOU in capitals. Occasionally they print a verb in capitals when it is in the second person plural, as 'PUT' in Ezr 4[21], but ordinarily this is not done. At the beginning of the volume they say capitals are only used for verbs where it is not clear from the context that they are in the plural. One would have thought it was as clear in Ezr 4[21] as in other cases where they are not used (for example, Neh 8[9f.]). In accordance with one of the fundamental ideas of the sect for which the translation has been prepared, the Tetragrammaton is always represented by 'Jehovah.' Apart from this the special ideas of the sponsors of the translation do not appear, save in a footnote in 1 K 20[13], where attention is drawn to the fact that in palimpsest fragments of Aquila's Greek version the Tetragrammaton is written in Hebrew letters, 'proving that the divine name did appear in the ancient Greek versions of the Hebrew Scriptures.' Actually this offers no evidence that it was pronounced by the reader, any more than it was pronounced by the Jew who read from the Hebrew, where also it was written. If Jehovah's Witnesses wish to appeal to this precedent to justify their insistence on the retention of the Divine name rather than 'the LORD,' it would seem to involve them in the necessity of printing the name in Hebrew, in accordance with the precedent. While the reviewer has no objection to the use of the Divine name and himself normally uses it, he cannot attach the importance to this which Jehovah's Witnesses do. If our Lord had rejected the unwillingness to pronounce the Name which was regular amongst the Jews in His day, it might have been expected that His disciples would have noticed and followed Him in this. Such evidence as we have indicates that when He quoted Ps 110 He used words which mean 'The Lord said unto my lord,' and not 'Yahweh said unto my lord.' Similarly, there is no evidence that in Ro 9[29] 15[9] or 2 Co 6[17] Paul ever wrote anything other than *Κύριος* to represent the Hebrew יהוה.

At the beginning of this volume there is a key to the symbols employed, and an explanation of the system of chain references given in the margin. At the end of the book there is a list of the national branch offices of Jehovah's Witnesses in seventy-three countries. Curiously enough, while England and Eire figure amongst them, Scotland and Wales seem to be unprovided with any office.

H. H. Rowley

THE TORCH COMMENTARIES

Two further volumes of 'The Torch Bible Commentaries' have appeared—*The Epistle to the Romans*, by Professor A. M. Hunter and *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, by Dr. William Neil (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. each net). A commentary must always be judged by that which it seeks to do. The writers

of these Torch Commentaries must solve two problems in order that their work may remain within its prescribed compass—they must decide what to leave out, and they must decide how to present the findings of modern scholarship without giving too much space to the discussion of the steps by which these findings are arrived at. This will often mean that they must ignore alternative interpretations which a larger commentary would deal with, and that they must often state as certainties things which they well know to be still *sub judice*. It could well be said that The Epistle to the Romans and The Epistle to the Hebrews are, with the single exception of The Apocalypse, the two most difficult books in the New Testament for the modern reader. Any one who undertakes to expound these books has undertaken a formidable task, and when that task is undertaken within the limitations of this present series it might even not unjustly be regarded as insuperable.

In his commentary on Hebrews Dr. Neil has risen triumphantly to his task. His Introduction is adequate. His exposition of such things as the priesthood,t he Tabernacle and its furnishings and its worship, the idea of the covenant are all masterly. He has well shown how to the writer of Hebrews 'Christianity is forward-looking and outward-going.' He is not afraid to be even startlingly relevant. 'The modern equivalent of the Jewish food regulations which the readers apparently cherished so fondly might perhaps be represented in the Christian Church by the advocates of Prohibition, Sabbath Observance, and Anti-Gambling. The general body of Church opinion while favouring moderation in drinking, enjoining respect for Sunday, and deploring the growth of betting does not see the answer to these problems to be a simple one, and would not wish to identify Christian witness with clamorous advocacy of what are in effect side issues.' A passage like that shows how Dr. Neil has courageously connected Hebrews with modern life and problems.

Dr. Hunter had an even harder task in writing on Romans to this scale. Superlatives are dangerous, but Dr. Hunter is right when he approves the saying of Professor John Knox: '*Romans* is the principal source book for the study of Paul's gospel, and in consequence unquestionably the most important theological book ever written.' The value of this commentary is much enhanced by the excellent paraphrases with which Dr. Hunter prefaces each chapter. He has a happy gift of phrase-making as when he describes Ro 13^{11-14} as 'Ethics *of Reveille*.' This book will be invaluable in clarifying the thought of Paul's most difficult epistle for the non-technical reader. It is, indeed, an outstanding proof that it takes a real expert to write a really simple book.

We are grateful for these volumes; we believe that they will be of the greatest use; and yet every time we open one of these Torch Commentaries we cannot help a pang of regret that such a team of writers was assembled, and then placed under such constricting limitations. A little more would have meant so much more.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

DOROTHY L. SAYERS ON DANTE

'I have sometimes played with the idea of writing a story, and dropping into it, casually and without comment, the following sentence—George was curled up comfortably in the big arm-chair, chuckling over *The Divine Comedy*.'

The idea will not seem at all outrageous to any who have read Miss Dorothy L. Sayers' Penguin translations of the 'Hell' and the 'Purgatory,' with their introductions, and in this volume—*Introductory Papers on Dante* (Methuen; 21s. net)—there is material for chuckles in plenty. There is, of course, much more. Barbara Reynolds in her Preface reminds us that Dante is not a 'popular' writer, and warns us that this is not a 'popular' book about Dante. It is not. It demands, and will richly repay, the closest study. It might well—with text or translation at hand—be our companion for most of a winter's nights. The hasty reader will miss much. And yet, in spite of its faintly intimidating title, it is by no means a book for the scholar alone. Throughout, Miss Sayers never seems to forget what she tells us in her Introduction: 'Dante wrote to be read by the common man and woman, and to distribute the bread of angels among those who had no leisure to be learned.' The scope of the book is wide as that of the 'Comedy'; there are two essays on Dante's imagery, and papers on the Fourfold Interpretation of the 'Comedy,' on The City of Dis, on The Comedy of the 'Comedy,' and on The Paradoxes of the 'Comedy.' There are some sixty pages on the meaning of Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory, pages which most readers will find much more than worth their weight in a like amount of writing in most formal treatises on eschatology. It is here that we find the author at her most challenging and most illuminating. Those who do not know their Dante will almost certainly be driven to him by reading them, but even if they are not, they will be richly rewarded. The chuckles are hushed here: 'The doctrine of Hell is not "mediæval": it is Christ's. It is not a device of "mediæval priestcraft" for frightening people into giving money to the Church: it is Christ's deliberate judgment on sin.' Or, from an earlier paper: 'The vision of Hell . . . is the vision, deeper than the psycho-analyst's

plummet ever sounded, of the possibilities of corruption in you and me, of the will to death and chaos, of the lie in the self.' But the pervading impression of the book is one of gusto. Take the passage on Dante's progress through Purgatory with the signs of the seven deadly sins on his forehead, 'like a man going along with something on his head which he doesn't know about': he doesn't know that already one of the signs has gone, 'Whereat,' he says, 'my Leader smiled.' 'To be sure he did,' comments Miss Sayers, 'and so do we, pursued by embarrassing recollections of paper caps playfully assumed and forgotten, honeymoon rice tumbling out of silk toppers, or the unwelcome attentions of pigeons—something on one's head one doesn't know about *until*—Dear, funny Dante—and at such a solemn moment too.' There are occasions when the only adequate review is a 'Thank you'; as one recalls the scholarly translator of mediæval French romance, the detective stories, the sacred dramas, the popular apologetic, the verse translations of the 'Comedy,' and now this golden volume, one is tempted to conclude, in an idiom which Miss Sayers will probably not resent: 'Thanks a lot!'

J. W. Baird

RELIGION AND SCIENCE

The Modern Predicament, by Emeritus Professor H. J. Paton (Allen and Unwin; 30s. net).

Gifford Lecturers have always been slightly sensitive about the implications of the Trust under which they lecture. The late Professor Susan Stebbing once suggested that they always had an axe to grind, and Professor Paton vehemently repudiates this implied restriction of their freedom of thought. He does not, however, adopt the devastating method of Karl Barth (who seemed to think that he could best serve the interests of natural theology by denying its existence) but prefers to show that a proper interpretation of the founder's intention gives abundant scope for independent investigation and speculation. He analyses the modern predicament in a masterly fashion, and sets forth his conclusions clearly and convincingly, never getting so absorbed in his thinking as to forget what he is thinking about. His results are neither negative on the one hand nor dogmatic on the other, but he is perhaps more successful in analysis than in the presentation of synthetic constructions, and what he has mainly to say is inspirational by its fineness of tone rather than because of its definiteness.

The present situation is due to the conflict—or maladjustment—between religion and science, and the remedy, the author thinks, is in the restoration of binocular mental vision. He reminds us that when one eye is weaker than the other, the weaker eye tends not to be used at all, and in modern man the scientific eye has the ascendancy. But science must learn that what it deals with is not all that is; and theology must refrain from claiming definite knowledge, must be willing to get rid of useless accretions (religions being like rose-bushes, requiring periodical prunings) and must remember that the value of the past persists for us only if instead of elaborating the conclusions of previous thinkers we meet our present problems in the spirit in which they dealt with those of a former age.

Professor Paton bases his assurance of religious validity on the wholeness of life and thought, and on the concept 'of a something beyond time and space or at least of a blank—perhaps even of a vaguely God-shaped blank—outside the bounds of our ordinary experience.' He pleads constantly for intellectual honesty or intellectual scrupulousness and he is bravely confident of the value of the response to God of which man is capable. The union of humility and boldness in his thinking is an example to all theologians, and it is significant that his chapter on 'Grace' is particularly beautiful. He gives short shrift to the traditional theistic proofs, but fortunately does not regard them as hopeless and thinks that with due care much might be made of them. He is certainly exceedingly critical of both scientists and theologians where he thinks this is necessary. Logical positivists and Karl Barth (he groups them together) come in for special castigation, and in his judgment Kierkegaard's opinions pass beyond the limits of sanity. But sympathy with, and encouragement of, all those who bravely face the problems of to-day are the dominant notes of this book. Archaism in thought and practice is the special danger of the Church. His general conclusion is that the scientific and religious attitudes should not be set over against each other, and that if scientists sometimes seem to be hostile to religion, the thinker is often very much more worthy of respect than the passing product of his thought.

W. S. Urquhart

WE PREACH CHRIST: CRUCIFIED

Readers of the valuable word-studies by the Rev. Dr. Leon Morris in this and other periodicals will be familiar with his thesis that what is linguistically wrong cannot be theologically right. The same concern for meaning, and the spirit of sound and constructive conservatism, which distinguished the examination of *ἱλάσκεσθαι* (The Expository Times, lxii. 227) and of *Wrath* (lxiii. 142) are displayed on a wider canvas in this his first full-scale book—*The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (Tyndale Press; 15s. net). He has

noted the fact, unfortunate but true, that in books on the Atonement many of the great Scriptural words tend to mean different things to different writers. He quotes, with approval, the comment in the 'Manual Grammar' of Dana and Manley: 'The obscurity . . . is not the result of linguistic ambiguity, but of theological controversy.' His contribution to the solution of the problem is to expound the meaning of six great theological words on the basis of an exhaustive examination of the sources of the New Testament vocabulary.

The words chosen—Redemption, Covenant, Blood, Propitiation, Reconciliation, Justification—are all crucial to the New Testament account of the Work of Christ. Each is submitted to careful scrutiny on the background of the LXX, the Papyri, and the Rabbinic writings. The examination involves reference to over one hundred Greek words, and is marked by wide and expert use of many authorities. When considering the words in the New Testament context, Dr. Morris does not forget that the Christian writers were free to modify and to enrich the words they use. He makes, from time to time, useful comment on the meaning of a 'technical term' in the New Testament, and exemplifies how much modern research has done to shed light on the meaning of words as used by the Early Church. He acknowledges his debts to other writers in the field but sometimes criticises their conclusions. The case made, for example, against Dr. C. H. Dodd's views on *Propitiation* appears sound, but he seems hardly fair to those who equate *Blood* with *Life*, attributing to them less than they say. When treating of emphases other than the one he is making, Dr. Morris is apt to say 'this is not to deny that . . .', and to leave the matter there.

The conclusions of the study, stressing the objective view of the Atonement, follow fairly from the evidence. Each word discussed points to what happened on Calvary, outside of man, giving us assurance of our salvation. In the end all depends on what God has done—and at great cost—and not on some effect on the human heart. In the course of the argument the word *substitution* occurs frequently, but a concluding summary, fortified by an illustration from Althaus, makes it clear that the word bears a meaning from which the objectionable legacy of the past has disappeared. The author is aware that it may not be easy to integrate his conclusions into a theory of the way in which the Atonement works. His main point, however, stands; we are never justified in evading the plain sense of the Greek.

There are a few minor misprints—for example, a misplaced accent, p. 8; a wrong initial, p. 33. Sometimes there is the tendency to assume rather too easily that other writers are at fault. These are small blemishes in a fine piece of work which will be of great value to the Biblical student and which does much to break down the barriers between theological 'parties.' We may hope that Dr. Morris will contemplate gathering the conclusions, and the implications, of his work in a positive statement of the doctrine of the Cross.

MARCUS WARD

TEMPTATION

No one will ever forget, and no one will ever wish to forget, that Dietrich Bonhoeffer died a modern martyr for his Christian faith. That very fact makes it very difficult to criticize his writings; and yet the fact remains that there is something of a Bonhoeffer cult in process of development, and that Bonhoeffer is in a fair way to become over-rated. The latest of his works to emerge is *Temptation* (S.C.M.; 3s. net). It consists of certain Bible studies on temptation which Bonhoeffer delivered to a reunion of clergy in 1937. Both in thought and in language—even allowing for the fact that this is a translation—the book is obscure. 'The Biblical meaning of temptation is not a testing of strength, but the loss of all strength, defenceless deliverance into Satan's hands.' We should hope that that is not true; and Bonhoeffer himself in a way says that it is not true. 'In this situation I can no longer act as a hero; I am a defenceless, powerless man. God Himself has forsaken me. Who can conquer, who can gain the victory? None other than the Crucified, Jesus Christ Himself . . . for He is by me and in me.' That kind of thing strains paradox to its utmost limit. 'From henceforth *we* shall no longer be led into temptation, but every temptation which happens now is the temptation of Jesus Christ in His members, in His congregation. We are not tempted, *Jesus Christ is tempted in us*.' Now that sounds as if it meant something, but it is very difficult to attach any very precise meaning to it at all. 'We should tell the devil that Jesus has called to Himself not the righteous but sinners, and that we—in defiance of the devil—wish to remain sinners rather than be righteous with the devil.' Bonhoeffer has a habit of torturing thought and torturing language in a way that obscures instead of illuminating. We are not sure that the publishers are doing Bonhoeffer any real service in giving to the public these early works. It is a notable fact that Bonhoeffer culls to himself as proof texts almost more texts from the Old Testament than from the New. And it has to be said that if he had simply investigated the meaning of the word *tempt* in Scripture and had realized that in many cases it means *test* it would

have saved him from a good many extraordinary statements about God.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

MISSIONARY POLICY

This pamphlet—*The Christian Church and Islam in West Africa*, by Mr. J. Spencer Trimingham (S.C.M. ; 3s. net)—is not to be judged in terms of its size. It is a careful presentation of the religious situation in West Africa and of the missionary policy which the author feels to be essential. Mr. Trimingham, who has spent many years in Muslim countries and has published two important books on Islam in the Sudan and Islam in Ethiopia, is at present engaged on a third volume on Islam in West Africa, of which he calls this essay an offshoot. He describes a situation in which the pagan population are eventually bound to make a choice between Christianity, Islam, or secularism, and he has many disconcerting things to say about the position of Christianity in Africa. He argues that Christianity is still an alien institution, whereas Islam is African. Indeed, his chief criticism of the Church in West Africa is that it is too much of an institution, and has not made sufficient impact on the daily life of the people. He feels that the Church has made a mistake in seeking the conversion of individuals, and argues that it would be more in line with the facts of African life to approach the whole village group, and within that, the family as the basic social unit. If this suggests the production of a merely nominal Christian community, he replies that such a community would provide a sphere for the deepening of Christian experience, and that we must ask whether we would prefer to see Africans nominal Christians or nominal Muslims. This pamphlet is an important statement which deserves careful consideration and discussion. JAMES ROBSON

Mastery, by Dr. E. Stanley Jones (Abingdon Press ; $1.75), has as its sub-title, 'The Art of Mastering Life,' and is further described on the jacket as 'Practical daily help in richer, happier living.' This book follows the pattern of many of Dr. Jones's other books. It gives a very short suggested daily Bible reading and one page of exposition for every day in a year. 'The modern man,' Dr. Jones says, 'knows everything about life except how to live it!' 'There are just two great human needs—*light on the mystery of life*, and *light for the mastery of life*.' In the opening verses of Acts Dr. Jones finds the seven pillars upon which the Christian gospel rests—the Word become flesh, the Word become revelation, the Word become vicarious, the Word become triumphant, the Word become final, the Word become a total way of life, the Word become dynamic—the Holy Spirit. Every page of this book is instinct with devotion. We are aware that this is an American edition, but if we were the author we would find it somewhat embarrassing to be described on the dust-cover as 'the world's best known missionary, evangelist, and religious author.' There are times when publicity defeats its own ends.

The Adult Education Council of the Church of England Council for Education has sent us a little book entitled *Why Bishops?*, by Professor H. E. W. Turner of Durham. While primarily for members of the Church of England, it is of interest to others ; and, indeed, study groups dealing with the subject of reunion would find it most profitable.

It deals with the origin, functions and traditions of the episcopate, and explains why Anglicans value it so highly. At several points the learned author indicates where there is difference of opinion between Anglicans, as well as where they differ from members of other traditions, and in his bibliography he gives both the late Bishop of Oxford's book on the apostolic ministry and Professor T. W. Manson's reply to it. This is a really useful book, well worth its price of three shillings and sixpence.

It is a pleasure to hear an expert lecture on her own subject, and that is what we have in an Ethel M. Wood Lecture by Miss Margaret Deanesley, published with the title, *The Significance of the Lollard Bible* (Athlone Press ; 2s. net). Who translated the Wycliffite versions ? Why was the first version translated word for word, and the second one meaning for meaning ? What part did politics play in the enterprise ? These are some of the questions asked and answered in this interesting study, which demands a revision of some formerly accepted views about an important part of the long story of the English Bible.

The Church Missionary Society's annual sermon for 1955 was preached by the Rev. Canon L. W. Grensted, D.D., and it is now published at 6d. by the Society under the title *What is Man?* The 'poor benighted heathen' stage of missions is gone, the humanitarianism that often succeeded it is clearly inadequate ; but what is the third stage to be ? It is at this point that Canon Grensted calls for close and objective study of cult and custom, so that the missionary may 'find the right symbols, symbols which will lose nothing of the great tradition of the gospel in the living Church, and which will yet ring true in the setting of the traditions and psychological needs of those to whom we preach.'

The Rev. G. T. Bellhouse of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Eastbourne, has collected eighteen sermons which he delivered to his congregation in the course of his regular ministry. They have been published by the Epworth Press (8s. 6d. net). The title which has been taken from the first sermon, a thoughtful exposition of Mark 14^{1}, is *The Hand of Glory*. This is a helpful and challenging volume.

Readers cannot fail to be attracted by the freshness and directness of Mr. Bellhouse's style. Moreover he has a flair for finding appropriate illustrations. As an example of the sermons we have given, in The Christian Year section, his study (slightly shortened) of Deuteronomy 33^{18}.

A book to be thankful for is *His Interpreters*, by Miss Rita F. Snowden (Epworth Press; 5s. net). Readers of her other books will know what to expect; yet they will find that this one is different. For each of the thirty-one days of the month there is noted a Bible reading. Then comes a story told with Miss Snowden's usual felicity of expression, a story of one of God's interpreters, that is to say, some one who in ways notable or obscure interpreted Him to others at the time, and now also to those who may read the story. Finally, for each day there are two prayers, one for the dawning and one for the closing of the day.

For the title of a series of lectures on preaching —*The Burden of the Lord* (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net)—Mr. Ian Macpherson takes the prophetic catchword which in the mouth of false prophets so sickened Jeremiah that he forbade its further use. Mr. Macpherson forces into the phrase the meaning that the burden of preaching *is* the Lord Jesus Christ. This truth is the keynote of this volume, redeeming it, whenever it sounds out, from triviality. The book gives, on evangelical principles, the low-down on the art of pulpiteering. It is a treasury of nearly all the best-known sarcastic aphorisms about the faults and follies committed in the pulpit, supplemented by witticisms of the author's own. It would make useful reading for any one called to lecture on preaching who wished to avoid what had been already said or quoted on the subject.

We confidently predict a cordial welcome in many quarters for *Calvin's Doctrine of the Last Things*, by Heinrich Quistorp, Lic. theol. (Lutterworth Press; 20s. net). The translation is by Dr. Harold Knight, who deserves congratulation on making it so clear and readable.

The subject is presented in three long chapters entitled Hope, the Immortality of the Soul, and the General Resurrection; but the table of contents is so full, with its headings and sub-headings, that the reader may quickly find a documented account of Calvin's views on the many topics comprised under the title of eschatology. The author finds a tendency in Calvin, which became stronger in later Protestantism, to limit and spiritualize the Christian hope in the direction of the salvation of the individual, and to neglect the cosmic breadth which is characteristic of the Biblical expectation of the end; but on the whole he finds that in this matter, as in his theology generally, the great Reformer is loyal to the Biblical message of the return of Christ and the Kingdom of God as an all-embracing reality.

The Church in this confused age badly needs a preachable doctrine of the last things, and it cannot afford to neglect Calvin's exposition, even though it will not be able to follow him at every point.

The Mission to Lepers traces its beginnings to a little meeting held in Dublin in September 1874. To mark the completion of eighty years a book has been written by the General Secretary, Mr. A. Donald Miller—not a history of the Mission, but an impression of its growth and success, with many examples of individual cases and with frequent reference to developments which the author noted during a recent tour of the Far East. This is now published by the Mission under the title *A Bridge of Compassion* at 5s. 6d., with an edition in limp covers at 4s. net. It is a moving story, graphically told; and we wish it many readers.

Books on the parables are legion, and they can be written from many different points of view. Their main interest may be to expound the fascinating Palestinian background against which they were spoken; or it may be to reach a Christian ethic for life and living; or it may be with a primarily or purely theological intention. *Many Things in Parables*, by Mr. Ronald S. Wallace, M.A., B.Sc. (Oliver and Boyd; 15s. net), is exclusively theological in its approach. Many will feel that its complete disregard of the historical and social and domestic background of the parables is a grave fault and a heavy loss. It is further perhaps true that Mr. Wallace brings a theology to the parables rather than finds a theology in them. When Mr. Wallace is writing on the Parable of the Tares and the Wheat he very naturally and properly deals with the problem of evil, and inevitably deals with the Cross. In that section he has certain things to say. 'Jesus Christ chose the scene and the time of conflict. It was all planned, and it was planned by God. Evil is here wholly under the command of God.' 'We can

take comfort and encouragement from this fact in these days of world-wide crisis. The whole of world history, even in its most violent and devilish phases, is under the control of Jesus Christ, who is King and Lord.' 'Evil must be allowed a certain degree of success, for only so can it reveal itself. To this development God has set decisive limits which must not be passed. It seems, therefore, as if God has to wait till evil has developed to a certain pitch before He will destroy it.' It is surely true that to teach such a theology is perilously near to making God say : 'Let us do evil that good may come of it.' So far from solving the problem this presents us with the agonizing problem of how God can be both good and loving and almighty and yet handle evil in such a way.

There is no doubt of the power and the depth and the scholarship and the real thought of this book. But we are bound to say that we consider that as an attempt to expound the thought of the parables it is a failure, however successful it may be in expounding the theology which the author has brought to it. The strange thing is that in the final chapter Mr. Wallace has a masterly account of the methods which should be brought to the exposition of the parables. The problem is how he has fallen short of his own methods.

The University of Durham Riddell Lectures—*Facts and Faith*, by Professor Reginald O. Kapp (Oxford University Press ; 5s. net)—are a model of honest and straightforward thinking, and the guiding principle throughout is that truth must never be sacrificed to attractiveness even though many cherished theories may have in consequence to be given up. The theme of the author is the conflict between science and religion, and his chosen title, if well considered, is meant to suggest that facts are not always, and exclusively, on the side of science. As regards the rivalry between monism and dualism, he is a convinced adherent of the latter. Rather surprisingly, he identifies monism with materialism, although he makes atonement for this narrow-minded restriction by showing in his beautiful concluding sentence a distinct tendency in the same direction as some of the most recent developments of Indian philosophy. His main argument is that the facts of physics do not provide a 'cosmic statute book' in the sense of requiring that things must be just so, and not otherwise. Lifeless things are random and not ordered ; the laws of physics are not discoveries, but methodological inventions of scientists.

The world is a composite of random and ordered events, and the higher you go, *i.e.*, from the lifeless to the living, the more obviously is order manifested. This order is evidence of the non-material, of the mental, not necessarily of conscious mind, but certainly of an influence belonging to another sphere than that which materialistic monists would acknowledge. In his concluding sentence he makes the far-reaching suggestion that by following the teaching of this book, man would 'gain what has never before been seen in the whole long history of evolution, a fleeting glimpse of self.'

A series of Bible Readings given at the Keswick Convention, 1955, has been published as *The Law of God in Christian Experience*, by the Rev. Ernest F. Kevan, M.Th., Principal of London Bible College (Pickering and Inglis ; 5s. net). This is a detailed study of the great central chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians set forth in appropriate sections, with memorable headings and with evangelical zeal and robust ethical appeal equally prominent.

At the Willingen meeting of the International Missionary Council in 1952 the theological section was the only one that failed to produce a report acceptable to the conference as a whole, and it was accordingly arranged to continue study on the theology of mission. A contribution to that study has now appeared in the I.M.C. Research Pamphlets series—*Towards a Theology of Mission*, by Dr. Wilhelm Andersen (S.C.M. ; 3s. net). This well-informed essay sets the Willingen discussion in the light of movements of thought from Edinburgh 1910 onwards, and points to further possible developments, it being clear that the relationship between theology and the missionary enterprise cannot be one-sided, if it is sound. There is a useful bibliography. Bishop Stephen Neill's translation makes pleasant reading.

The Bridges of God, by Dr. Donald Anderson McGavran (World Dominion Press ; 7s. 6d. net), is a study in the strategy of Christian Missions. Drawing a strong contrast between the 'People Movement' and the 'Mission Station Approach,' Dr. McGavran urges that the modern strategy should be to hold lightly all mission station work which cannot be proved to nurture growing churches, and to throw in all available resources at the growing points where Christward movements within peoples are advancing at the rate of fifty per cent. per decade or more.

The author, himself a station missionary for many years, makes a strong case both from the general history of Christian expansion and from recent experience. Professor K. S. Latourette contributes an introductory note and Sir Kenneth Grubb a foreword.

Contemporary Religious Trends

Evangelism To-day: One Particular Enterprise

By the Reverend Canon E. Moore Darling, Coventry

Out of every hundred people of this realm no more than ten have any serious connexion with organized religion. No one with even a slight knowledge of the standards and outlook of the vast majority of our massed population can fail to know that a devastating wave of materialism is sweeping the country. Whereas as recently as fifty years ago you failed to achieve respectability unless you 'went to church on Sunday,' it is possible to-day to be given the complete approval of your neighbours without ever going near a church except for baptisms, marriages, and funerals. Even those three occasions fail to give us much comfort. So many baptisms lack any sense of a great religious occasion and in so many marriage services the religious ceremony is swamped by the social occasion. That is the position of this country to-day. What can we do about it?

In order to get a clear picture of the problem that faces us, it may be well to recapitulate the causes which have resulted in the serious situation which prevails to-day. First among them is the fact that whereas the ideas of Darwin and Huxley have so to speak been adjusted in the mental climate of study and classroom, that has not been the case with the mind of the man in the street. Again and again the panel of a Religious Quiz is asked whether the Old Testament is 'true.' Again and again the questioner fails to realize that evolutionary theories are concerned, not with *who* made the world, but with *how* it was made. Misunderstanding of biological theories is followed by muddled thinking about the work of the modern physicist. Added up, it amounts to a feeling (for it *is* feeling and not reason) that science has debunked religion. Thus, what used to be accepted as truth beyond all argument, is now very often rejected as a fairy tale.

Next we must consider the effects of two world wars in one human lifetime. First, with father in the Forces and mother on munitions, family life was cracked and family discipline disappeared. Second, deep-rooted and wholesome ideas of the value of human life were swept away in the wholesale slaughter, whilst everywhere might seemed to triumph over right.

The third underlying cause of the mass-drift from religion is maybe the most potent of all and is to be found in the Trade Unionist's conviction that while he fought for better wages and working conditions the churches in the main were on the side of the haves, not the have-nots. Thus, an agricultural labourer once reminded me that when the men of Tolpuddle were transported not a word was said by organized religion, though the only crime of these simple men was to meet together to discuss how their conditions might be bettered.

If this very simple analysis of the causes of the present situation is correct, three colossal tasks lie before us. We must tell the man in the pew, the pub, the railway carriage, fully and honestly, what we do and don't believe, and why we do or don't believe it. Then, too, we must make full use of the Press, the Radio, Quiz Panels, and so on. At present our efforts are no more than a drop in the ocean compared with what is needed. There must be no mental reservations, and the minimum possible use of such technical terms as the Grace of God, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Salvation by the Cross, and so on. Two things are essential. What we say must make sense *to the listener*, and we must somehow convince him of our own real personal belief in the things we write and say.

Our second task is to help recreate family life, and here I believe that our efforts must be based on rebuilding a worshipping community—which, mark you, is something different from a mere congregation, for a worshipping community not only *prays* as a fellowship but *lives* as one, sharing a social and cultural life as a family. Maybe this will take several generations. Even so, one is convinced that in dealing with the ninety per cent, the slow way back is the only way back. I know one church where a generation or so back there were four to nine communicants on Sunday. To-day there are two hundred—and they *are* a worshipping community of the kind described. When asked how it was done the laconic answer of the parson was 'one at a time.'

The third task is so colossal as to be terrifying. One just doesn't know where to begin with the seething millions in field, factory, and workshop, more than ninety per cent. of whom have been lost to religion (I wonder if, in honesty, we ought to write lost *by* religion?). We must go to them in penitence for our past failure to act as the Body of Christ, frankly admitting that we have ever and again fallen short of that high ideal. We must

convince them of our own flaming belief in the gospel of Jesus Christ—and we shall do it much more by what we *are* than by what we *say*. Above all, we must put into practice that great dictum of Canon Lloyd, Diocesan Missioner in the Winchester Diocese. He wrote: 'You'll never argue men back to religion. You can only love them back.' Again, as in the case of building up a worshipping community, it resolves itself into a case of one by one.

I have been asked to describe an eighteen-month-old attempt to treat a factory as a *pastoral unit*. Without entering into details it is impossible to do so. Consequently the rest of this article will follow carefully the sequence of events in a very high-grade factory devoted to making machine tools and employing some four hundred and twenty men. Let it be added that the men are highly efficient and highly paid.

The thing began when one was invited to discuss the position with the directors. The Managing Director summed up—'We've got a forty-hour week,' said he. 'Wages are about as high as anywhere in England. Welfare work is of the highest order. The canteens are excellent. Yet there is something missing and it's vital. As a result I always feel that there's a queer sense of frustration abroad. What can you do about it?' A week later the directors were given a written memorandum of the conditions which seemed necessary to success. First, the idea was to be discussed with Trade Union representatives *before* it reached shop level. Second, it was to be made clear that the Chaplain would receive neither a stipend nor travelling expenses, but would look on the work as part of his job as Diocesan Missioner. Third, he was to be given right of access to the factory at all times without reporting at the desk and similar privileges inside the factory, *i.e.*, he could talk freely at will to the men at their benches. Fourth, it must be everywhere understood that nothing said to him by the men would be repeated to the management.

These ideas were promptly accepted. For my part a guarantee was given that I'd spend 10.30 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. in the factory on one day each week, lunching in each of the canteens in turn, beginning with the men and ending with the directors. The job has been going on for eighteen months and the week has yet to come when my factory visit has been missed. If this sort of job is undertaken at all it must be given the same priority as, say, the 11 a.m. service on Sunday.

Frankly, the first visit was as terrifying as it was utterly exhausting. Luckily the first man I spoke to smiled at me, and when I asked him about some technical detail of the job he was on he was obviously pleased to explain it to me. That was the first vital lesson learned. These men were craftsmen in steel and were more than willing to talk about their craft. Even to-day, at the end of a year and a half, that fact remains one of the main bases of contact. It is the royal road to getting alongside the shy or silent man. Note that your interest must be *real* and *intelligent*. If it is not real the men will at once scent patronage. If it fails in intelligence you will simply be written off as a fool. Ignorance is different, for you are not expected to be expert in their job.

For the first five hours in the factory this was about all that happened, except that I sensed a feeling of awareness that something new was being tried, a sense of caution, maybe even of suspicion.

Then, one day fairly early on, an older man said, 'Padre, Bill over there has just lost his mother. You might have a word with him.' I waited until Bill was crossing the aisle of the shop, quietly expressed the sympathy I felt, inquired how the loss would affect his domestic affairs, and went away. The very next week the same man came to me and said, 'My mate's lost *his* mother. If you'll go out and sit in your car I'll send him out to you, because he's very upset.' Never once in the opening weeks was religion even mentioned. As soon as the men realized this, their greatest doubt was removed. They now knew that the Chaplain didn't talk religion unless they 'began it' and begin it they very soon did, not in masses but a man here and another there, asking about some issue of the moment—Billy Graham, the question of divorcees remarrying in church, a Radio talk of mine. As time went on that last was maybe my best friend for it is easy for a man to say 'On the air last night you said so and so. My idea is this . . .' and away you go.

The best avenue to the minds of the younger men was via the football team. Each of them would express his views on Saturday's match, so that at the end of the season when they were playing a cup tie final it was quite natural to go to the dressing-room and wish them luck. It wasn't difficult to discover their hobbies—fishing, bird-watching, gardening, small livestock, and so on. You'll guess from all this that we were slowly getting to know each other and that, in time, and quite naturally, one began to hear their troubles. This was a sort of snowball effect, one man telling another of his experience of talking things over. Then came what to me was a frankly surprising development. I was asked by one of the older men to visit his aged father who was ill. This work, too, grew rapidly, and it at once became evident that the dual contact, at home and in the factory, was the ideal combination. Indeed, one dates a real 'jump' in progress from those first days of visiting, for in a subtle way one felt nearer the

men to whom one had talked by their own fireside or in a hospital ward.

It seems to me to be very necessary to know all the men in the factory who are active members of a church, of whatever denomination. It is easy to talk to them about their local church and its activities, easy to inquire what they, personally, are doing for their church, easy to invite their aid in keeping informed about sickness, domestic trouble, or any particular worry concerning individuals known to them on the shop floor.

One is constantly being asked, ' Isn't this a very specialized job, and particularly one demanding long and wide experience of men and matters ? ' I think that it is, if by ' specialized ' you mean a job demanding particular human qualities rather than special academic qualifications. I do not, for instance, believe that you could plan training courses for this particular sort of factory work. It is always difficult to make a cold-blooded analysis of the qualities necessary for any job, because you everlastingly get men who manifestly do not qualify, but who nevertheless do the job splendidly. For what they are worth, here are the qualities which experience suggests are of most value in this simple but subtle work. You *must* like people. You *must* believe in the inherent possibilities of goodness in human nature. You *must* believe that Christian values are valid. You *must* have the gift of self-forgetfulness. On that fourfold basis you are bound to meet men on the level, forgetting ecclesiastical office or social strata, and remembering only that ' We be brethren.' It is necessary to be reasonably well-informed. Put it that you ought to have read at least two newspapers every day ! The Briton being what he is, it is a help to be interested in games—but don't pretend to be if you are not. Indeed, never pretend anything. If you do you've had it. A good memory is invaluable. If, for example, you hear from a man this week that his son has a broken arm, he is unlikely to believe that you are really interested in him if you have forgotten it next time you meet—and remember that it is utterly essential that he should so believe. The fact is surely obvious that the more things you are interested in the easier different types of men will find it to talk to you.

I've kept a very necessary quality until last, *i.e.*, a sense of humour. It is an immense help if you can enjoy a joke (even against yourself) and make a joke. Nothing goes so far in oiling the wheels. No experienced man needs to be warned of the danger of being over facetious. That is serious, but not as fatal as being consistently dull ! Above all, learn early on to watch for the man who is anxious about something. He doesn't, for the moment, want humour. He wants sympathy, and understanding.

I am often asked ' Do you think that you are getting men back to Church ? ' The answer is that this is not the immediate, even though it may be the ultimate, object of a Factory Chaplain. Put it that the immediate idea is not so much the bringing of them back to Church as the bringing of the Church back to them ; giving them the conviction that the Church cares ; that religion really is concerned with the common man and his ordinary life ; that her ministers are human, approachable, understanding, and capable of standing on their own feet without the aid of a privileged position or the protection of a pulpit ; that those ministers are at least trying to obey their Master's order to ' go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in.' Thus it is that the Factory Chaplain's work is not a substitute for normal parochial activities, but a bridge between them and the ninety per cent. of the population who have no share in those activities. It may be permitted to say again that it is manifest that the mountain has no least intention of going to Mahomet. Here is a serious attempt to meet the situation by sending Mahomet to the mountain.

The reader will probably have realized that this is a technique whose application is limited to factories of not more than say four hundred and fifty men, and cannot be carried out in vast workshops, where men are feverishly engaged on piecework at the conveyor belt. Even so, there are more than enough of the smaller factories to employ many times our available men, so let us by all means get on with them. That is not to dismiss masses of men in factories employing several thousands as beyond our reach. They *must* be reached and it is up to us to find a way.

Three lines of approach suggest themselves. First, and obvious, what has been already written can be put into practice in such sections of the big factories as make it possible. Second, very strenuous efforts can be made to gain the interest and support of key men, both among operatives and management. Third, and by far the most important, by very virtue of their size these big places employ large numbers of apprentices. Marked success has met the running of what are called Leadership Courses for these apprentices, preferably of a residential nature, so that pupils and teachers share a corporate life during the Course. It may well be that a modern industrial Diocese will be considered incompletely equipped unless it is able to house and staff such Courses.

To me, the call of the ninety per cent. stands as the great challenge to and opportunity for organized religion to-day. The task is immense, but so is the flood of unattached, largely unused goodwill. The man in the street is biginning to realize what is his own deep need. We can and must supply it.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

That's Just the Difference

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'That ye may put difference between the holy and the common, and between the unclean and the clean.'—Lv 10^{10} (R.V.).

In a book of memories Arthur Porritt, who was for long editor of *The Christian World*, told that when he was a lad at school in Lancashire he—like every other boy in the school—was a great devotee of a form of sherbet called 'kali.' The lemon flavour was sold in yellow boxes, the pineapple flavour in green boxes, and the orange flavour in orange boxes. There were serious playground feuds about the respective merits of the different flavours.

Then on holiday his father secured permission for young Porritt to go round the factory where the stuff was made. At last he came to the kali department. There on a table he saw a huge mound of kali, round which sat three girls. One had a pile of yellow boxes, another a pile of green ones, and the third a pile of orange. And, to his chagrin, he saw them all filling the boxes from the same pile. In high dudgeon he cried, 'Look, you're putting lemon kali into the orange boxes.' But the girl replied with a grin, 'It's all right. There's no difference in the kali. It is only in the labels on the boxes.'

And kali is not the only thing in the world which tries to disguise itself in different dresses. I know some schools where they use all sorts of subtle words to distinguish people's taking ways. It is 'borrowing' or 'boning,' or 'winning,' or 'snaffling,' or 'scrounging.' But there is no difference really.

There are some untruths which we dub 'fibs,' some we call 'tall stories,' and some we call 'whoppers.' There are lies and 'white' lies—or so some people would have us believe. But the colour doesn't change the nature of the evil thing. And if you and I are to be disciples of Jesus Christ we dare not have anything to do with it.

It does not always bring popularity if we stand out for the difference between truth and falsehood, and sometimes it brings real opposition. When Ahab asked the prophets whether he would be successful in battle, they all said he would. Then he sent to another prophet, Micaiah; and the messenger who summoned him whispered in his ear, 'All the rest have said that the king will be victorious. I thought I would let you know.' But Micaiah was made of sterner stuff. 'What the Lord saith unto me,' he answered, 'that will I speak.' It cost him the king's anger and a spell in prison, but he knew that he had to distinguish between truth and falsehood.

The Christ whom we follow 'set His face like flint to go to Jerusalem.' His followers, too, must know the difference between right and wrong.

Here is a prayer we use in school sometimes: 'Grant to us, Lord, to know that which is worth knowing, to love that which is worth loving, to praise that which pleaseth Thee most, to esteem that which is precious unto Thee, and to dislike whatsoever is evil in Thine eyes. Grant us with true judgment to distinguish things that differ, and above all to search out and to do what is well pleasing unto Thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord.'

Are You a Philumenist?

By the Reverend Canon T. E. Edmond, M.A., Little Heath, Herts

'I am the light of the world.'—Jn 8^{12}.

Are you keen on philumeny? No! Perhaps you don't know what a philumenist is? Neither did I until I read about it in the paper. A philumenist is a collector of matchbox labels! It is surprising how many of them there are. A conference has recently been held in London of all those who engage in this unusual hobby. The British Match Box Label Society was founded in 1948. It has four hundred members. One collector has eighty-five thousand labels from sixty-five countries. It is even rumoured that one veteran member of the society in America has a hundred and twenty thousand specimens. Some of these labels are very beautifully designed, but the Society is very worried because the Secretary says that 'British labels are awful.'

Every Christian should be a philumenist. This strange word means 'a lover of the light.' We should always love the light. That is what Jn 3^{20} says: every one 'that doeth truth cometh to the light . . . every one that doeth evil hateth the light . . . lest his deeds should be reproved.' A boy who is frank and open about everything need fear nobody. A girl who is sincere is never afraid of the light.

A classic story tells of a horse that every one admired, but nobody could tame. Alexander, afterwards the Great, watched every would-be

rider thrown off, and then asked permission to try. He took the great horse by the bridle and led him out into the face of the sun, mounted and rode away. The legend says that when he returned in safety, his friends asked him to explain. Alexander had noticed that the horse was afraid of shadows, when his head was turned away from the sun.

So we must learn 'to walk in the light.' We must keep our faces turned towards the sun. For the Christian the path is clear. We will walk through life 'looking unto Jesus, the Pioneer and Perfecter of our faith.' We have no need to be afraid any more, if we keep our eyes fixed on Him. If we give our hearts to Him, He will keep us in the light. We will do only those things that shall please Him who said, 'I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.'

The Christian Year

SEPTUAGESIMA

The Secret of Endurance

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, B.D., TH.M., GLASGOW

'He endured, as seeing him who is invisible.'—He 11^{27}.

1. The writer to the Hebrews is, of course, speaking about Moses—one of the most remarkable men, on any showing, in all history. He gives the same impression of having lived several distinct and separate lives as do so many of the great—Winston Churchill, for example, or Albert Schweitzer. For Moses there was, first of all, his youthful life at the Egyptian court. Then came a time of withdrawal to the country after his unhappy intervention in the fight between an Egyptian and an Israelite. While he tended the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law, he was being prepared for the next phase, his conflict with Pharaoh which ended in the Exodus. The fourth and last phase was the forty years wandering in the wilderness as the leader of his people till the day when he turned his face up to the mountains where he was to die. It is an astonishing biography. Of course he made his mistakes, as all the great do, but—he endured. The one grand purpose which had laid hold of him at the beginning underlay all that he did. At times he faltered and wavered, but before he even fell, he was up again and on with his great task. He endured. That is what makes us so envious of him. Our lives are so 'bitty,' so erratic and spasmodic. We have, most of us, our moments of vision, our times of dedication and high purpose and resolution, but they don't last. We forget and the years slip by filled with nothing glorious or sustained. We jog along, harmlessly for the most part, but aimlessly. Unharnessed to our wills our occasional spurts of faith run out in sentimentality of which we are at once ashamed. We all had once our hopes of doing some grand work for God but—Moses endured.

2. How? The writer of Hebrews is quite clear on that. He endured 'as seeing.' The others just looked. He saw. That was true right at the beginning in the incident of the Burning Bush. Elizabeth Barrett Browning is looked on as trite nowadays but the following is worth quoting in this connexion.

> Earth's crammed with heaven,
> And every common bush afire with God;
> But only he who sees, takes off his shoes,
> The rest sit round it and pluck blackberries.

Thousands of Bedawin had seen a eucalyptus tree on fire, and had passed 'unseeing' on their way. They were in a hurry on business bent or pleasure. They had no time to sit round burning bushes. So is it ever. We are so busy being important that we miss the important things. We look all the time but we never see. Countless folk had watched an apple fall, but only Newton saw in it the law of gravity. Millions must have watched the lid of a kettle dance as the water boils, but only Watt saw the possibility of a steam engine in it. Aircraft designers aplenty must have watched gulls soaring, but only to Mitchell did they suggest the Spitfire. All of us can look at a landscape. Only the artist sees and catches the glorious beauty of it. Long before Kant taught us how much our own notion of space and time and our own experience supply, men knew that what they saw was made up not only of what was 'out there,' but also of that which was in their own mind. All Jews knew their national history. Only Moses saw in it evidences of a grand design. Others looking at the Israelites in Egypt saw a handful of sullen and degenerate slaves. So did Moses, but he also saw something shining out from behind their frustration, something which might turn them into a great people, fit for the Land of Promise, ready for the use of God. That vision was real, for it has endured to this very day, while the things other men were gazing at—flocks and herds, temples and palaces—have passed away.

So has it ever been. Men and nations endure not by reason of wealth or arms but by the vision without which they surely perish. Each statesman fired with the thought of a people united, peaceful and free; each architect who sees the building before a sod is cut; each parent who works and sacrifices and dreams for the child who lies unconscious in the cot; these all are spurred on and sustained by that which they see which is hid from other eyes. They endure—like Moses—as seeing.

3. Finally, of course, it was not what Moses saw, but whom, that kept him going. The secret of his endurance was that he was a 'called' man. And when God calls to a task, He gives also the strength to do it. He sends no man forth to warfare at his own charges. Moses endured because he saw the Invisible God, which is impossible. But it happened. Others were as certain of that as he, indeed more certain. He 'wist not that the skin of his face shone' when he came down from the Mount of God, but the people saw and marvelled. It was not that Moses had some magic secret denied to all other men. For it is the plain truth that He whom Moses saw was invisible—as invisible to Moses as He is to us, and as inaudible. People who don't allow for the Oriental habit of vivid exaggeration are apt to think that it was easier for Moses than for us. It wasn't. God is fair. He hides Himself just as much from one man as from another, from one generation as from that which succeeds it. God who is the Eternal must be the unseen. What Moses saw were the signs of His passing near, His back parts, as the Authorized Version quaintly has it. To no man was given more than that till Jesus came.

Just before Jesus died, Philip, hungering as Moses had for face-to-face knowledge of God cried 'Lord, shew us the Father.' You remember the answer? 'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' 'No man hath seen God at any time,' not even Moses, who was called God's friend. 'The only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him,' and in Christ, the very image of the Invisible God, we may see the glory of the only begotten, full of grace and truth. By that grace and truth we shall be able to endure till that day when, no longer blinded by our eyes, we see Him as He is. Meantime let us heed the call to endurance and learn the secret of it from Him of whom alone it could be said with perfect truth 'He endured, as seeing him who is invisible.'

SEXAGESIMA

The Voice of God

BY THE REVEREND J. ITHEL JONES, M.A., B.D., LONDON

'And the word of the Lord came unto Jonah the second time.'—Jon 3^1.

What a pity that Jonah did not listen the first time! It is surely one of the tragedies of our Christian life that God has to say the same thing over and over again.

It should not be so. We believe that God speaks. We believe that God speaks the truth. And we believe that the truth is best for us in the long run. The logic of the matter is as relentless as that.

But still we do not listen and God has to repeat Himself. The word of the Lord comes to Jonah a second time. To us it comes a third and a fourth time. And a fifth. And even then we do not obey. It is a wonder we are not completely undone.

This sermon is an unashamed plea that we should listen to the voice of God the first time. I know He is willing to repeat Himself. His patience, like His mercy, endures for ever. But I would entreat you not to let the word of God come a second time.

1. *For your own sake.* Of course, the word of God is difficult of obedience when first it comes. Augustine hears it and half rises to it. Then he shrinks from it. He longs to be holy, 'but not yet.' He will let God speak again, later.

How well we know it. The word of God comes to us and as we hear it its challenge is undeniable. It rings a bell in heart and conscience. But as soon as we leave the sanctuary or close the Book, the chimes die away. What we should do for our soul's safety is cling to the rope of the bell and keep it ringing in the corridors of the heart until its message has been heard and acted upon.

The trouble is, of course, that when the voice of God is first heard, immediate obedience would seem to cost too much. Jonah felt that. 'Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it. . . .' But Nineveh was an important place, the capital of great Assyria, a power noted for its conquests and boasted pomp and show. 'Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown.' No; it was not an easy assignment. It would mean being mocked and derided. It might even mean hazarding his life. And Jonah ran away from it all.

But the story makes it abundantly clear that it had been better for Jonah if he had obeyed the command of God the first time. By the time the voice of God spoke a second time, the prophet had had to suffer storm and shame and the darkness of an awful grave. Immediate obedience, costly as it may be, does not cost as much as allowing the word of God to come a second time.

I wonder when the word of God first came to Saul of Tarsus? In recounting the story of his conversion, he speaks of the voice as charging him with 'kicking against the pricks.' How long had he been resisting the word of God? Running through a good deal of his testimony is a feeling of remorse that he had allowed himself to become the arch-persecutor of the Church of God. How many pangs of spirit would he have been spared in later days if only he had hearkened to the word of God the first time?

God knows the timing of His speaking. How much better it is, then, for our own sakes, to listen the first time. For listen we must in the end. If

you are a child of God you can never finally escape His word. Jonah thought he could. He went down to the quayside and found a ship bound for Tarshish. He found enough money in his bag to pay the fare. It was all very convenient. It looked as if circumstances were conspiring to aid his little scheme. But the voice of God came after him and in precisely the same terms.

It always does. Francis Thompson found it to be so.

I fled Him, down the nights and down the days;
I fled Him, down the arches of the years;
I fled Him, down the labyrinthine ways
Of my own mind. . . .

But it was of no avail, for

with unhurrying chase,
And unperturbèd pace

the Feet followed him. And with the Feet a Voice.

And so, the longer and the further we seek to flee, the worse it is for us. How many people have suffered pain and inconvenience because of a strange fear of the operating theatre. And when, finally, they give in and find that the trouble is put right, they scold themselves for not having submitted long ago!

Divine surgery is no different. The word of God is an instrument 'sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow.' Why not let it do its healing work right away? For all our misgivings, delay will cost more in the end. It is better, far better, to accept the word of God in simple obedience the first time it comes. For our own sakes!

2. *And for the sake of God Himself.* Nothing is more tiresome to a teacher than to have to repeat himself *ad nauseam*. And while God is infinitely patient, He cannot delight in having to bring the same message over and over again. This is putting the matter at its lowest.

But it is even more serious. Our failure to listen to God the first time must mean to some extent a delay in the fulfilling of His great purposes. We sometimes take great comfort in Paul's reassuring words in the opening of his letter to the Philippians about the One who has begun a good work in us, going on to finish it until the day of Christ. We like quoting the story of Cologne cathedral which took over six centuries to build, but which, in spite of delays and set-backs, was completed in 1880 according to the precise plan of 1248. But there is another side to that impressive story. If there had been no forgetfulness and intentional hold-ups, many a generation, borne away too soon by the flood of time, would have enjoyed the glory of the place. But they missed the boon.

The believer's obedience is the channel of blessing to others. When Jonah finally obeyed and brought the message to Nineveh, the people repented and 'believed God.' And the city was saved.

His word comes to us with such strange insistence because He seeks thereby to bring the knowledge of Himself to those among whom our lives are set. Each time we come, then, to the sanctuary or to the Book or, indeed, to any situation in life in which He can make His word known, let us come with the prayer of Samuel: 'Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth.'

QUINQUAGESIMA

The Fullness of the Gospel

BY THE LATE PROFESSOR D. M. BAILLIE, D.D., OF ST. ANDREWS

'The fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ.' —Ro 15^{29}.

According to the Revised Version, it reads 'the fulness of the blessing of Christ,' leaving out the word gospel, and no doubt that is what St. Paul wrote, though we are rather sorry to have the familiar verse changed. But it doesn't make any difference to the meaning. My subject is the importance of a complete Christianity—not a one-sided version of it, but the whole of it.

The reason I take this subject is because people are so apt to leave out one or another of the essential elements of the gospel; and so my best plan will be to indicate these different kinds of one-sidedness.

1. *Don't forget His teaching.* That is what evangelical Christians sometimes almost leave out—the plain practical ethical teaching of Jesus, the Sermon on the Mount, the Golden Rule and all it carries with it.

What a large part of His time Jesus spent in teaching, and how much of His teaching is practical moral teaching as to how we ought to live! There is no doubt Jesus Himself attached a tremendous amount of importance to that part of the gospel—the doing of God's will in actual daily practice. 'Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?' 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father.' What could be plainer than that? And there is the solemn parable that stands at the close of the Sermon on the Mount, telling us that the man who hears Christ's words and doesn't do them is like a man who built his house on sand, while the man who hears and does them is like a man who has built his house on a rock.

Yet evangelical Christians sometimes aren't very

fond of the Sermon on the Mount—as if it weren't part of the real gospel. Remember that it is in the Sermon on the Mount, in the very forefront of that mighty challenge, that we find the Beatitudes, which tell us of the secret of the blessing. 'Blessed are the meek, blessed are the merciful,' and so on. Fogazzaro has spoken somewhere with satire of 'the people who believe in the miracles, but don't believe in the Beatitudes.' Such people are not uncommon. And yet if you don't take the Beatitudes seriously, you are far away from the blessing of Christ.

But let us not speak of other people. Let us think of ourselves. Some of you must have read that remarkable book, *The Life of Kagawa*, the Japanese saint, surely one of the greatest Christians living in the world to-day. There is a man who *lives* Christianity, spending his own money recklessly on schemes for rescuing the down and out, living in poverty, a friend of sinners, overcoming evil with good, claiming nothing for himself; and yet finding the radiant joy of Christianity, the beatitude of the gospel, because he does take the Sermon on the Mount seriously. It makes us wonder why we aren't trying to do it more. We know that we could, every day, find occasions of being more just and considerate to our neighbours, more merciful to our enemies, more unselfish, more willing to lose our lives, for Christ's sake, in love for other people. If you want the blessing of His gospel, don't forget His teaching.

2. *Don't leave out His Cross.* That is another mistake, that other people make, sometimes the very people who are keen on His teaching.

When we do first get captivated by the wonder and truth of the teaching of Jesus we are apt to say that is all that is needed, that is Christianity—that, and not any mysteries of atonement and salvation. It is a noble, a divine way of living. If only everybody would live like that, then the world would become like heaven on earth.

Yes, if . . ! And that is just where we discover that we need a completer gospel than that. I believe that in the modern world, up to the War and even beyond it, there has been a good deal of the rather easy optimism which believed that good teaching alone could put the world right—a mild and benevolent and hopeful humanitarianism. But people are discovering that the world is far more difficult to redeem than they imagined. I wonder whether we mightn't say reverently that even Jesus Christ had to make that discovery as His ministry went on. He found that human nature, with all its possibilities of good, has also all sorts of kinks and twists, and it doesn't always respond at once to good teaching like the Golden Rule. And so the career of Jesus Christ went on from the Sermon on the Mount to the Cross on the Hill. He practised the Golden Rule, but they responded by shedding His blood.

Well, that Cross, ever since, has been part of the gospel, indeed the very heart of it. It speaks to us not only of the evil that is in human nature, but also of the power that is in Divine love. It speaks to us not only of the love of Jesus, but thereby also of the love of God, which bears the sin of the world. It speaks to us of how sin can be forgiven, and good brought out of evil, because God loves us. And 'God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' That is what we need: a gospel that will have something to say to us when we realize what a poor business we have made of trying to follow the Sermon on the Mount and the teaching of our Master. Then we need His Cross. Then we need the forgiving redeeming love of God. If we try to do without that, we miss a great part of the fullness of the blessing of the gospel.

Kagawa tries to live out the Golden Rule. Yes, but he doesn't think that is the whole gospel. Listen to this sentence of Kagawa's: 'The formula is the Golden Rule plus the Blood of Christ.'

3. *Don't forget His Victory.* I believe that is another element we often leave out of the gospel; and yet it would hardly be a gospel at all without that. A great many Christian people do miss the fullness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ by being very earnest without being glad and confident and victorious, without even expecting to be more than conquerors. It is almost as if they thought the Crucifixion was the end of the story. Don't we often make that mistake, as regards the whole tone and temper of our Christian lives? But we never find Christ's early followers in the New Testament feeling like that. They were glad. They thought of Christ as a triumphant Victor, and they knew they would be victorious too. 'Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.' And that is the true note of Christianity.

A short time ago I was looking at a replica of Michelangelo's great sculpture, *The Risen Christ.* The Cross is there all right. But Christ is not nailed to it in the agony of death. That is all past now. He is standing on the ground, standing upright, with the Cross beside Him, and His right arm is around it. He is victorious. That is the ultimate spirit of Christianity.

We Christians ought to have something of the note of victory and confidence, calm strength and joy and gladness. Let us all claim that great heritage. It is the crowning glory of a Christian life. I don't believe it always comes all at once. But it ought to come. We shouldn't be content to go on without it. Life ought to become better and richer and gladder for us every year we live if we

are Christ's people—yes, even amid all our troubles, because we have our share in the victory of the Lord Jesus Christ.

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT

The Deep that Coucheth Beneath [1]

'And for the deep that coucheth beneath.'—Dt 33^{13}.

I find as I get older that the one test I am inclined to apply to a book, a play, a picture, a piece of music, is this. Is the author of this book or play, the painter of this picture, the composer of this music conscious of the ultimate bigness and mystery of things, and does he by his work arouse a similar consciousness in me? And most of us, as we grow older, react, I imagine, in much the same way. It is why some of the books and plays which rather excited us in our youth seem strangely vapid, almost irritating now. With the years we have come to realize that life is too big, in some of its aspects too tragic, to be merely clever about, and the only rightful attitude to take up before it is one of great humility and reverence.

1. There is a deep that coucheth beneath all things, and no superficial treatment of life will ever permanently satisfy. To begin with, think of the deep that coucheth beneath ourselves. Modern psychology has made us familiar with this in its teaching about the subconscious. In all of us, hidden deep down, there is a strange storehouse of racial memories. There are also deep down our own personal early impressions, our fears, our distrusts, born out of we remember not what experience, queer, crude urgings. When we are fit and busy we are not very conscious of these hidden things. But let us get a little run-down, and they emerge from their dark lairs to plague us. And in our dreams. And when we are alone. So Siegfried Sassoon once wrote:

I thought how strange we grow when we're alone,
And how unlike the selves that meet, and talk,
And blow the candles out, and say good night,
Alone . . . The word is life endured and known.
It is the stillness where our spirits walk
And all but inmost faith is overthrown.

Who of us has not been sometimes made vividly aware of that queer deep that coucheth beneath our normal, waking life? By regular, disciplined prayer and worship we must sink down deep into it the image of Jesus and His Cross. Only so shall we possess that 'inmost faith,' of which the poet speaks, which cannot be overthrown.

2. Then think of the deep that coucheth beneath our fellows. 'I have been taught over and over again,' writes Mark Rutherford, 'that unknown abysses, into which the sun never shines, lie covered with commonplace in men and women, and are revealed only by the rarest opportunity.' Every minister and doctor knows how true this is. In one of his novels H. G. Wells wrote:

'The streets are alive with people, grave, decorous-looking people. They pass intent upon their various businesses with an air of knowing exactly what they are and exactly what they are doing. And last night this self-possessed young woman bit her pillow and beat the air with clenched hands and cried: "O God! O God! Shall I never escape?" And that grave and respectable gentleman with the gold-tipped cane stared out of his bedroom window with the dawn and wished and came near contriving another man dead. . . . This is the life that in the daytime and commonly we hide from ourselves. The night is its time for revelation. . . . The angel and the ape appear. The morning finds us already most sedulously forgetting that dreadful interview with our bare selves. We dress, we examine our faces in the glass to be sure that we are masked before we risk the observation of our fellow-masqueraders.'

The deep that coucheth beneath our often apparently commonplace fellows. Supremely was Jesus aware of it. He invariably lifted the mask, the mask of Zacchaeus, of the woman of Samaria, and looked deep down into the real person beneath.

In our dealings with our fellows, never let us be taken in by the surface appearances, the surface explanations. Reverently delve down into the deep that is full of all manner of crude urges, frustrations, envies and jealousies and self-distrusts, the deep that has for its centre a 'God-shaped blank' which nothing on earth can satisfy, but only God in Jesus.

3. Then think of the deep that coucheth beneath life itself. Often we are unaware of it. Then suddenly it erupts and envelops us. We do something cruel or dishonest or shameful, and wherever we turn we seem to hear the cry: 'Thou art the man.' We try to shirk an obvious duty, and everything seems to go wrong, thorns seem to be planted about our feet. We argue there is nothing in religion and prayer, give ourselves up to a mere surface existence, and

Just when we are safest, there's a sunset-touch
A fancy from a flower-bell, some one's death,
A chorus-ending from Euripides,—
And that's enough for fifty hopes and fears
As old and new at once as nature's self,
To rap and knock and enter in our soul.

A great deep does seem to couch beneath life, the great deep of God's concern for each man's soul,

[1] G. T. Bellhouse, *The Hand of Glory*, 107 ff. This is reviewed in the Literature section.

and it sometimes rebukes, sometimes withstands, sometimes chastens, sometimes consoles, sometimes challenges, but it is there all the time, and when we are still we can hear its voice. Who in the light of it can doubt immortality? God surely would not so concern Himself with our deepest development if at the last we were to be simply cast as rubbish to the void.

4. Finally, think of the deep that couches beneath the Bible. Beneath the Old Testament. Not so very long ago, in a desire to come to terms with modern scientific thought, there was a certain turning away from the Old Testament. We know better to-day. We realize the deep that coucheth beneath those old stories: the story of the creation, of the garden of Eden, of the tower of Babel, a deep that remains eternal in its significance. And the New Testament. Jesus, a man like ourselves, some said, but like which of us, we ask to-day. The miracles in the Gospels, some wished they were not there—just the teaching, but in the light of the supreme miracle of all, Jesus Himself, to-day we ask who would dare to say what was possible to Him and what was not. And the teaching, the discourses of the Upper Room, as you read them, an awe steals over your spirit, deep calls unto deep. And Paul, some used to say he spoilt the simplicity of the Gospels. Now we realize that when his writing becomes difficult it is because of the depth of the religious experience which he is struggling to express. 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!' he writes. 'The unsearchable riches of Christ.' 'That ye may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge.' When we read words like these, we feel that in the matter of religion we are but children in the primary school; realize that many of our perplexities come not, as we often say, from our experience of life, but rather from the poverty of our experience of God, 'The deep that coucheth beneath!' 'Dwell, deep,' twice pleads Jeremiah in the forty-ninth chapter of the book which bears his name. It is only as we do dwell deep that we are likely to find a true philosophy of life. Above all, it is only as through worship and prayer we dwell deep that we shall find God, for it is in the deeps, not in the shallows, that the great experiences come.

Contributions and Comments

The Days of the Son of Man

THE article entitled 'The Days of the Son of Man,' by the Rev. Robert Leaney, which appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of October 1955, recalls other attempts to interpret this very difficult verse —Lk 17^{22}. J. M. Creed, for example, said of the expression 'one of the days of the Son of Man,' that it referred to 'one of the days of the new age after the Son of Man has been revealed.' [1]

Mr. Leaney's interpretation is not unlike that of Creed, for he thinks that the Evangelist had in mind a number of appearances of Christ. For both interpreters, 'the days of the Son of man' are days of bliss, whether the final consummation has arrived, or whether it is yet to come.

It is worth while to consider also the suggestion of Dr. T. F. Glasson.[2] For Dr. Glasson, the 'days of the Son of man' are certainly not days of bliss. They are days of 'careless living.' Dr. Glasson draws attention to a feature which is, I think, given less than its due significance by the interpreters mentioned above. Taking the whole passage, Lk 17^{22-37}, Dr. Glasson points to parallel features in the verses which refer to the Flood, the destruction of Sodom, and the impending doom upon Jerusalem.[3]

Each of these events is preceded by a group of 'days,' thus, the 'days of Noah' are followed by 'the day Noah entered into the ark'; 'the days of Lot' are followed by 'the day Lot went out from Sodom'; 'the days of the Son of man' are followed by the events described in *vv.* 30 ff., 'the day of the Son of man.' There is a reference in all three cases to 'days' which are followed by a 'day.'

If we are to do justice to the mind of the Evangelist, then we must take this feature of the passage into account in any interpretation of the saying in *v.* 22. The 'days' of Noah, Lot, and of the Son of man, are the days when men live in careless ease. The 'day' of Noah, Lot, and of the Son of man, is the time when living in careless ease meets with its due reward. I think that this refers to the time of the Final Judgment, in spite of Dr. Glasson, whose view of the eschatology of Jesus I cannot accept. But if he is right, as he may be, and the 'day' refers to some other crisis, the point of interpretation, namely that 'the days' precede 'the day,' holds good, I think, on any view of what 'the day' is.

The very difficult question as to why the disciples will desire to see one of these days of careless ease must now be considered. Creed offered no suggestion. Mr. Leaney thinks that the disciples will think of the days of Christ's appearances 'in the grim days ahead.' Dr. Glasson writes: 'Verse

[1] *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, 220.
[2] *The Second Advent*, 83–88.
[3] I do not share Dr. Glasson's confidence that there is a reference to 'the doom which is to come upon Jerusalem' in this passage, but the point is irrelevant here.

22 cannot be interpreted with certainty and is difficult on any view.' Thus, if we do not accept Mr. Leaney's interpretation of ' the days of the Son of man ' we must find an alternative explanation of the words addressed to the disciples.

' The days of the Son of man ' are the days when men live in careless ease ; they are grim days, when men are regardless of the things concerning the Kingdom of God. Why will the disciples long to see one of these days ? What is the meaning of this saying ? Two possible interpretations come to mind.

Though these days are days when men live without heed of the coming Kingdom, they are days when repentance is possible. ' The day ' is the time when repentance is no longer possible, for the doom will have fallen, the judgment will have taken place. But, assuming the saying is authentic, it is difficult to imagine that Jesus addressed His disciples thus. Did He anticipate that they would be on the wrong side of the judgment, and placed beyond the possibility of repentance ? I think not. On the other hand, if the Evangelist has given as a saying addressed to the Twelve one which was in the first instance addressed to the Jewish nation or part of it, then *v.* 22 might have this meaning.

Nevertheless, Luke gives it as addressed to the disciples, and he must have understood it to mean something ! The question is what did he understand it to mean ? I think the desire to behold one of these godless days which precede the final catastrophe which is coming upon the world is probably a way of expressing the gravity of that impending calamity. The impending trouble, the like of which there has not been in the past, and there will not be in the future, is so grave that the godless ' days ' which precede ' the day ' will seem desirable in comparison. This means that the disciples will have some experience of the Final Judgment, they will witness the end, and will desire not to witness it, on account of the terrible nature of the sudden catastrophe which will occur. One of the preceding ' days ' would have been preferable to that which they now behold. But, whilst it means that they will witness the Judgment, this interpretation does not necessarily mean that the disciples will be on the wrong side of the Judgment. They will witness the Judgment, even if they themselves are not its recipients.

E. Ashby

Marlpool, Heanor

Books Lent by Post

In these days when books, especially theological works, are increasingly expensive, it is becoming almost a necessity for clergy, ordinands, lay readers, Sunday School teachers, and Bible students generally to have recourse to a good postal library. So in case any of these groups in the Provinces do not happen to have heard of it, I am venturing to bring to their notice Dr. Williams's Library, 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1.

This Library, founded in 1716 by the Rev. Dr. Daniel Williams, ' is primarily a theological library intended for the use of ministers, students, and other persons engaged in the study of philosophy, theology, ecclesiastical history, the history of religion and kindred subjects.' It also contains works on general history, sociology, and literature both ancient and modern.

The Library has recently published a new catalogue, listing books added from 1900 to 1950. I have gone through the first fifty pages of this large catalogue and have selected the following titles to show that this Library can be of benefit, not only to clergy and ordinands, but to studiously minded lay men and women. Here are my selections :

Alexander, A. B. D.	*A Short History of Philosophy.*
do.	*The Thinkers of the Church.*
Aulen, G.	*Christus Victor.*
Baillie, D. M.	*God Was In Christ.*
Baillie, John	*And the Life Everlasting.*
do.	*Our Knowledge of God.*
Balleine, G. R.	*A History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England.*
Barclay, A.	*The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.*
Bardenhewer, O.	*The Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church.*
Barnes, E. W.	*The Rise of Christianity.*
Barrett, W. F.	*On the Threshold of the Unseen.*
Barth, Karl.	*The Word of God and the Word of Man.*
Bartlet, J. V.	*Early Church History.*

Leonard Chidley

Liverpool

Recent Foreign Theology

Survey of Biblical Journals. The first part of the first volume of a new publication which catalogues articles on Biblical subjects appearing in learned journals was noticed in The Expository Times for March 1954 (lxv. 189). The second part of this volume has now appeared,[1] and it completes the survey for 1951–52. It has been prepared by a

[1] *Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete*, vol. i. part 2 [1951–52]. Patmos-Verlag, Düsseldorf ; DM 22 or $5.40.

large international team of scholars, both Protestant and Catholic, and it takes account of more than four hundred journals. More than twelve hundred articles are listed, and in almost every case there is a short abstract of the article in question. Every side of the study of both Testaments is included, and there is here an absolutely invaluable tool for the serious Biblical scholar, who wishes to keep abreast of what is being done in Biblical study in journals. Many of the journals are difficult of access, and in any case no one could keep in touch with all that is appearing in so many countries, without such help as this review provides. The price has had to be raised above that first indicated, but the work is well worth the money.

The Hebrew University Dead Sea Scrolls. Of the Dead Sea Scrolls which first came to light, four manuscripts came into the possession of the Monastery of St. Mark's and three into that of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Three of the St. Mark's manuscripts have been published in full in facsimile and transcription,[1] while hitherto only a few columns of the Hebrew University texts have been published. The work of publishing them was entrusted to the late Professor Sukenik, whose lamented death deferred its completion. At last the texts have been issued in a sumptuous edition, with a short Introduction in Modern Hebrew, and with a collection of plates on loose sheets, together with a printed transcription.[2] There are no notes on the text, but Sukenik's son, Yigael Yadin, has in the Press a very elaborate edition of the Battle Scroll, in which full notes in Modern Hebrew will be supplied. Meanwhile scholars everywhere will be glad to have access to the full text at last. The three manuscripts are an incomplete second MS. of Isaiah (15 plates), the scroll which has been called The War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness (19 plates), and the Hymns (24 plates). The Hymns resemble the Psalms of the Old Testament, but the Battle Scroll lays down rules for the organization and conduct of the army that should first of all defeat the Kittim and should then systematically conquer all countries. It should be added that many of the plates of facsimiles are beautifully clear, but a few are less clear than could be desired.

The Biblical Jubilee. In Lv 25 we find the law of the Jubilee in the fiftieth year, which seems so impracticable that it is commonly doubted whether it was ever seriously followed. Father R. North, of the Biblical Institute in Rome, has now published a very thorough study of this law, preceded by a bibliography of nearly forty pages.[3] He gives a translation of the chapter of the Bible from the Hebrew, the Greek, the Syriac, and the Latin of the Vulgate, but maintains that the Hebrew is substantially reliable. He then discusses every sociological aspect of the legislation in the light of ancient Oriental sources and Jewish sources down to the rabbinical commentators. Whether the law was ever observed he refrains from surmising, since any answer would need to have many qualifications, but he notes that the Book of Jubilees makes no allusion to the economic practice of the law. As for the date of the law, Father North ascribes it to the period of the occupation of the land, but thinks it was a modification of an older usage, not by an author, but by an authority, of that period. On the problem of the Jubilee year following the seventh fallow year, he thinks that the number fifty was used loosely to mean forty-nine. In a closing chapter on the 'Social Theology of the Jubilee' he expresses the view that some messianic typology is to be found in the law, in that it depicts a future era of abundance and contentment, and that this typology 'refers proximately to eternal redemption in Heaven, but includes also the redemptive life of Christ and means of grace such as the sacraments, and, in its way, the Holy Year.' For an introduction to the problems of the Jubilee and the views that have been put forward for their solution this book will be found most valuable.

Sumero-Accadian Wisdom. All modern works dealing with the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament set it in the background of similar literature from Egypt and Mesopotamia. A Dutch doctoral dissertation dealing with Sumero-Accadian Wisdom literature is of much interest and value in this connexion.[4] The author first surveys some of the literary *genres* employed, and examines the Sumerian conception of wisdom, and then gives in text and translation some samples of the well-known verbal duel type. Here three samples are given: Summer and Winter, the Precious Metal and Copper, the Shepherd and the Labourer. The second part of the work turns to some other forms, of which the last will perhaps most interest the Biblical scholar. This cites some texts under the heading of 'Innocent Sufferers.' For many years now we have been familiar with examples of this type of text in which a sufferer cries to his god for

[1] The fourth has not yet been able to be unrolled.

[2] E. L. Sukenik, אוצר המגילות הגנוזות שבידי האוניברסיטה העברית [1954]. Mosad Bialik and the Hebrew Univeristy of Jerusalem.

[3] *Sociology of the Biblical Jubilee* [1954]. Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Rome; Lire 3900.

[4] J. J. A. van Dijk, *La Sagesse suméro-accadienne: Recherches sur les genres littéraires des textes sapientiaux* [1953]. Brill, Leiden; Fl. 15.

relief from suffering which he is at a loss to understand, and they are often brought into relation with the Book of Job. Actually what similarity they have is with a very minor aspect of the Book of Job. In the present work comparisons with Biblical passages are not made, however, and the reader is simply presented with material from the Mesopotamian sources in the field of Wisdom for its own sake.

The Qumrân Scrolls. In a short paper reviewing recent work on the Qumrân Scrolls,[1] Canon J. Coppens raises a *caveat* against the common identification of the sect of the scrolls with the Essenes. He emphasizes differences from the Essenes, so far as they are known to us, and some syncretistic elements in the faith and practice of the sect of the Scrolls, and thinks the Qumrân sect may be an off-shoot from a tree which produced a number of Jewish sects. He also appears to favour the view of J. Rabinowitz,[2] that the Damascus of the *Zadokite Work*, whose connexion with the sect of the Scrolls is generally recognized, is none other than Qumrân. In a paper read to the Society for Old Testament Study, Father R. North, of Rome, argues independently for the same view.[3]

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester University.

[1] *Où en est le problème des Manuscrits de Qumrân?* (*Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia*, 2nd Series, No. 44) [1954]; Belgian Fr. 10.

[2] Cf. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxxiii. [1954], 11 ff.

[3] Cf. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, lxxxvi. [April, 1955], 34–48.

Entre Nous

Communication

An experiment in communication has been carried out by George W. Barrett and J. V. Langmead Casserley—*Dialogue on Destiny* (Longmans; 4s. net). The two authors presented the chapters as dialogue sermons in the pulpit of Trinity Church, New York. It is to be noted that the dialogues do not consist of discussions represented as being between a convinced believer and one who is hostile to the Christian faith; they are dialogues represented as being between the parish priest and the honestly inquiring, but genuinely puzzled, layman.

There are certain advantages in the dialogue method. It expresses the faith in terms of a series of answers to questions which people are really asking. 'The greatest danger that confronts a preacher and teacher is the answering of questions that are not in fact the ones which the inquirers are asking.' The very fact that two voices are speaking is a defence against monotony and makes listening easier. It enables the clergy to collaborate, and compels an individual clergyman to deal with matters which otherwise he might never have dealt with, because every man, consciously or unconsciously, has his favourite subjects, and is dangerously liable to confine himself to them.

The subjects are of the greatest importance—The End of the World, Death and after Death, Heaven and Hell, Kingdom Come. The parish priest says: During World War II an army chaplain came to address a Woman's Auxiliary in the parish of which I was rector. He said: "I am doing exactly the same thing that the Church is always supposed to be doing—preparing men to die." ' The mind may shrink from that—but the fact remains that it is true.

There is an interesting and wise examination of the idea of progress. When people talk about progress, 'progress is much more concerned about the human race than about individual human beings. . . . There is always jam to-morrow, never jam to-day. The progressive mind seldom cares about human beings as such.' It is like the breeding of animals. The breeder is not so much concerned with the individual animal of the moment, as with the animal which will some day emerge from that particular strain. Scientific progress and Christian realization are by no means the same thing. In the Christian way of thought 'the end of man,' or 'the end of all things' in the New Testament 'does not mean the point in time at which man ceases to be, but rather the point in time at which man begins to be what he was always meant to be—in the Kingdom of God.'

It goes without saying that this book is thoroughly abreast of all modern scholarship and absolutely honest in its facing of the problems which are presented. This is a small book whose value is far beyond its price. It indicates a method of presenting the truth which has vast possibilities, and it treats the truth in the most illuminating way.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Quotable Sayings

Speaking from the preacher's point of view *Walking with God*, by the Rev. W. J. Smart (Hodder and Stoughton ; 10s. 6d. net), is the kind of book of which we cannot have too many. It is sub-titled, 'The Challenging Witness of Christian Lives in the Modern World,' and it contains short biographical sketches of twelve great modern Christians. There is not a page on which there is not some illuminating and quotable saying or story. Kagawa's prayer on accepting Christianity was : 'O God, make me like Christ.' Studdert Kennedy said of Christian theology that it was an effort 'to express the stars and the stones, the winds and the waves, the laughter and the tears, the pain and the peace of the world in terms of Jesus Christ.' When people expressed amazement at the discoveries George Carver made, he used to answer : 'Anything will give up its secrets if you love it enough.' When Aggrey, during his professorship in America, took charge of two humble Methodist congregations and tried to preach to them, he said : 'I was in an aeroplane and I had to come down.' Thinking of the insults and the humiliations that his colour often brought to him, he said : 'Keep your temper and smile ; that's what Jesus meant when He told men to turn the other cheek.' Edgar Helms, the American social reformer, said : 'What the poor need is not a hand-out, but a hand-up ; not a coin in the hat, but a tool in the hand.' Once when Sundar Singh came to call at a house, the maid who opened the door said to her mistress : 'There's some one at the door who wishes to see you ; I can't pronounce his name, but he looks like Jesus Christ.' In addition to the people mentioned, the book contains biographical sketches of C. F. Andrews, Edith Brown, Otto Dibelius, Joseph Mindszenty, William Temple, and Wilfred Grenfell.

The Vitality of Faith

The Rev. Murdo Ewen Macdonald, Minister of St. George's West, Edinburgh, the church associated with the great names of Whyte, Kelman, Hugh and James Black, has published a volume of sermons entitled *The Vitality of Faith* (Hodder and Stoughton ; 10s. 6d. net). They are sermons which bring us face to face with the central truths of the faith. With vigour and the utmost urgency Mr. Macdonald proclaims 'the terms of God's decisive deliverance.'

Many of his illustrations come from his War years—he was with a parachute battalion and ended his military service in Stalag Luft III. The illustrations are direct and rich in spiritual appeal as is borne out by the following two paragraphs.

Courageous Resoluteness

'Why do you think Captain Carlsen captivated the imagination of the world ? Because he possessed what men deep in their hearts admire and even worship—courageous resoluteness. We Christians have lost it. We are too conventional and cautious and calculating. We captivate no one's imagination. We rouse no soul-stirring interest, and we are simply ignored. Anatole France once, in a mood of bitter self-criticism, said, "I have spent my life twisting dynamite into curl papers." When you think of the rebel, revolutionary faith of Jesus and the timid, shadowy, colourless thing we have made of it, it is too terribly true that we are just playing "twisting dynamite into curl papers. . . ."

'Do you know what hurt me most during the war ? Not the catastrophic collapse of public and private morals ; not the noisy crumbling of the very pillars of civilization ; not the unspeakable suffering and the senseless, bloody carnage of it all ; not that, but the spectacle of courageous men who died in their thousands and had no use for religion. They defeated the Nazis, laughed in the face of death, died with a fierce and gay abandon, and felt nothing but a searing contempt for the Christian Church. And the reason ? Because we who profess Christ are so timid and irresolute and colourless. We have taken the dynamite of the Cross and twisted it into curl papers.' [1]

Natural Simplicity

'As an undergraduate of St. Andrews University I witnessed a very dramatic incident. Professor W. P. Paterson was addressing a large student gathering. For over two hours he answered question after question in profound and brilliant manner. Then suddenly he said, "Let us pray," and like a little child dropped to his knees before us all. The effect created was overwhelming. Afterwards a vociferous agnostic remarked, "I found his answers brilliant yet unconvincing, but that last act of his—it got me." ' [2]

[1] Murdo Ewen Macdonald, *The Vitality of Faith*, 76 f.
[2] *Ib.*, 144.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.